

Austin/Travis County Continuum of Care

Governance Recommendations

Background

In February 2020, the Ending Community Homelessness Coalition (ECHO) contracted with Homebase to conduct an analysis of the current governance structure for the Austin/Travis County Continuum of Care (CoC) and make recommendations for improvement. The CoC, which consists of all relevant entities and organizations that address homelessness in the geographic area, was particularly interested in ways to improve the functioning of the Membership Council and related decision-making processes for the CoC. The process was to be inclusive of a diverse array of stakeholders to gain a comprehensive and unbiased understanding of both the strengths and areas for improvement within the existing structure.

In early March 2020, Homebase began to ramp up work to conduct the related analysis, including forming a Governance Planning Committee. After a few initial meetings, the governance analysis was put on hold due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In November 2020, Homebase relaunched its governance work in Austin/Travis County CoC. As part of this effort, Homebase staff conducted over 25 one-on-one or (self-selected) group meetings with over 40 stakeholders. The interviews were held with stakeholders representing a wide variety of interests within the CoC, including members of the Membership Council, ECHO's Board, City of Austin staff, CoC committee and workgroup leadership, people with lived expertise of homelessness, the faith-based community, and ECHO staff. Interviewees were encouraged to candidly share their opinions related to the functioning of the Membership Council and CoC governance in general.

In addition to interviews, Homebase conducted a publicly-available online survey, which received over 40 responses. The survey covered issues related to CoC structure, strategic planning, communication efforts, and equity/inclusion. The survey also included several open-ended questions to allow participants to provide a narrative response.

Homebase presented its initial findings from the interviews and survey, and solicited guidance on next steps, at the December 2020 Membership Council meeting. Several areas of focus were identified:

- **Redefining composition and role of the Membership Council:** There was consensus that the Membership Council was too large of a body and that this resulted in disengagement or inconsistent participation. Additionally, there was a sense of confusion about Membership Council’s role in the community’s efforts to prevent and end homelessness in Austin/Travis County.
- **Improved Decision-Making:** The current consensus decision-making model employed by Membership Council was identified as an impediment to the CoC’s ability to tackle difficult issues and often lead to indecision. Many stakeholders thought the Membership Council held a myopic view, focused largely on HUD CoC Program funding requirements, and lost sight of larger issues that could have more of an impact in addressing homelessness.
- **Increased intentionality around equity/representation by people with lived expertise of homelessness:** Many people interviewed expressed concerns that Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and people with lived expertise of homelessness were underrepresented on the Membership Council and associated committees and workgroups, especially considering the overrepresentation of BIPOC in the local homeless population. Increasing diversity and empowering BIPOC and people with lived expertise with homelessness within the CoC structure was identified as a priority.
- **Address Conflicts of Interest:** In addition to confusion about what constituted a conflict of interest in Membership Council decision making, stakeholders were concerned that homeless service providers were overrepresented, and local governments underrepresented, in the Membership Council and overall CoC.

Homebase also provided several trainings to Membership Council members and general CoC stakeholders on governance best practices and plans to conduct a session on addressing CoC conflict of interest in January 2021.

Overview of Recommendations

Based on the information gleaned from those conversations, our knowledge of best practices, and work with similarly-situated communities, Homebase developed several overarching recommendations to refine CoC governance in the Austin/Travis County Continuum of Care:

- (1) **Revaluating the purpose of Membership Council** to allow focus on higher-level CoC issues (shifting away from details of NOFA) and homeless response system alignment.
- (2) **Being more intentional about the composition of the Membership Council**, including empowering historically underrepresented voices.
- (3) **Shifting of day-to-day CoC responsibilities** from the Membership Council to the CoC lead agency and a well-defined committee and workgroup structure.

- (4) **Formalizing and organizing Membership Council, committees, and workgroups** to foster healthy disagreement, work toward systemwide goals, and increase accountability, equity and diversity.

Specifics on how each of these recommendations will affect the CoC’s governance structure are detailed in the following sections. The sections are divided by entity to clearly outline how the roles, responsibilities, composition and focus of each entity or organization may shift in order to meet these goals.

Membership Council

The Membership Council currently serves as the HUD-mandated board that every Continuum must create to oversee the response to homelessness within the CoC. The most successful CoCs are led by strong boards comprising a broad range of higher-level stakeholders that are collectively representative of relevant entities and organizations addressing homelessness in the geographic area.

Membership Council Membership and Representation

There are a few HUD requirements that pertain directly to the makeup of the Membership Council. First, Membership Council members must be selected using a written process adopted by the CoC, contained in the CoC’s Governance Charter, and reviewed, updated, and approved by the Continuum at least once every 5 years. The Membership Council should also be representative of the relevant stakeholders interested in preventing and ending homelessness within the CoC and include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual.

As such, the Membership Council should consist of representatives from some combination of the following:

<u>Seat(s)</u>	<u>Representative(s): Examples of local organizations (not an exhaustive list)</u>
Required Representatives:	
Lived Expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homeless or formerly homeless individuals, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Austin Youth Collective (AYC) Austin Homelessness Advisory Committee (AHAC)
Optional Stakeholder Representatives:	
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local government staff/officials, CDBG/HOME/ESG entitlement jurisdictions, Public Housing Authorities (PHAs), etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Austin - City Council Member City of Austin – City Manager

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Public Health (APH) staff • Housing Planning Department (HPD) Staff • City of Austin – Equity Office • Travis County – Affordable Housing Policy Committee representative Housing Authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HATC ▪ HACA
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitals, EMS/crisis response teams, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin-Travis County EMS Advisory Board representative • CommUnity Care – Healthcare for the Homeless • Central Health • Dell Medical • Ascension Seton • UT Medical School; • St. David’s Healthcare • Austin Hospice • People’s Community Clinic
Mental health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental health service organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Mental Health Authority – Integral Care • Waterloo Counseling • National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI)
Substance abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substance abuse service delivery organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin-Travis County Sobering Center • Texas Harm Reduction Coalition
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School administrators, homeless liaisons, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Help • Local school district representatives • Local institutes of higher education (UT Austin, Austin Community College, Huston-Tillotson University, etc.)
Criminal justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law enforcement, local jails, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Justice Coalition • Austin Police Department, Planning & CIT • APD Downtown Commander • Travis County Adult Probation • Austin/Travis County Re-Entry Roundtable • Travis County Public Defender’s office • Travis County Criminal Justice Planning & Research • Travis County Juvenile Probation Department
Disability services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disability service organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disability Rights of Texas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Rio Grande Legal Aid • Mayor’s Committee for People with Disabilities
Victim services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoC-funded/non-CoC-funded victim service providers, advocates, agencies that serve survivors of human trafficking, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAFE Alliance • Texas Advocacy Project • Asian Family Support Services of Austin • Survive to Thrive • Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking • Allies Against Slavery • Casa Marianella • UT -Institute on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault • Refugee Services of Texas
Veterans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VA, veteran service organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Veterans Administration ○ Commission of Veteran Affairs
LGBTQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGBTQ service organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vivent • Out Youth Austin • The Kind Clinic • Austin LGBT Chamber of Commerce • Equality Texas • UT - Gender and Sexuality Center • LGBTQ Quality of Life Commission • allgo
Youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoC-funded/non-CoC-funded youth homeless organizations, advocates, etc., including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LifeWorks • American YouthWorks • OutYouth • Project Help • SAFE Alliance • Street Youth Ministry
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street outreach • Employment, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workforce Solutions • Easter Seals • Goodwill • Housing/housing developers, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation Communities • Community First • HousingWorks

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Apartment Association • Faith-based community, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trinity Center • Sunrise Community Church • Businesses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Austin Alliance • Other homeless subpopulation advocates, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YWCA
--	---

HUD also requires that the CoC establish a code of conduct and recusal process for the Membership Council, its officers, and any person acting on behalf of the CoC-designated board. This is necessary because Membership Council members are subject to a strong conflict of interest requirement: “No Continuum of Care board member may participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefits to the organization that the member represents.”¹ The CoC should be mindful of this conflict issue when determining the makeup of the Membership Council, so as to avoid seating too many members that have potential conflicts with large CoC-related decisions, such as voting to approve the Consolidated Application submitted to HUD for CoC Program funding (typically referred to as the NOFA).

To ensure cohesion and promote efficiency, the size of Membership Council should be set at a manageable level, **consisting of no more than 11-15 voting members**, ideally maintaining an odd number. Membership Council members should be **leaders, local champions, and influential stakeholders** in the community’s efforts to end homelessness. Recruiting people who are comfortable with making difficult decisions and have authority in their respective fields bolsters the CoC’s ability to achieve real change.

The Membership Council meetings should remain open and function in a transparent environment, but **voting should be restricted for only those people seated as voting members**. To avoid confusion, we recommend the **elimination of the “advisory” member seats** that are currently part of the Membership Council structure. To the extent the stakeholders currently holding those positions meet the guidelines for stakeholder representation and leadership detailed above, they should be considered for voting positions.

Diversity and Lived Expertise

Continuing to strengthen and elevate the voices of BIPOC and persons with lived expertise of homelessness, and ensure they are authentically, equitably, consistently, and proactively engaged in CoC decision-making processes, is a clear priority for the

¹ 24 CFR 578.95(b). In Austin/Travis County CoC, the Membership Council acts as the HUD-required CoC board.

Austin/Travis County CoC. This includes providing additional opportunities to participate in decision-making processes, offering training and appropriate supports, and engaging in broader efforts to proactively engage BIPOC and persons with lived experience.

Ensuring **equitable representation should start at the Membership Council level**, and be **mirrored throughout all CoC entities, including committees, workgroups, and other decision-making bodies**. Actively engaging in outreach to and recruitment of historically underrepresented groups should be a priority in the Membership Council member selection process. A focus on retention of BIPOC and people with lived expertise selected to serve on the Membership Council is also crucial.

While HUD *requires* only one person on the CoC Board have lived expertise of homelessness, providing adequate representation to those with lived expertise is a deeply-held value in the Austin/Travis County CoC. As such, two seats on Membership Council should be reserved for people with lived expertise, with a **requirement that at least one-fourth of all Membership Council members have lived expertise of homelessness**. This can be achieved by seating members with lived expertise in other stakeholder categories, so that they simultaneously represent that stakeholder group and the voice of people with lived expertise.

There should continue to be a concerted community effort to focus on building strategies and action items to increase diversity at the CoC level. Developing and formalizing policies to inclusively and actively engage BIPOC and people with lived expertise of homelessness is proposed as one of the topics undertaken in the inaugural Roadmap for the CoC (see below).

Proposed Membership Council Composition

It is recommended the CoC strive to seat the Membership Council in the following way:

<u>Stakeholder Group</u>	<u>Number of Seats</u>
<p>Government</p> <p>Recommend including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Government staff/official 2. City of Austin Homeless Strategy Officer (consider as a standing position with no turnover) 3. Housing Authority City of Austin <p>Also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • League of Cities 	3 Seats
Homeless Response System Providers	2 Seats

Rotate seats to represent homeless response system providers.	
Health and/or Disability Services	1 Seat
Mental Health/Substance Abuse	1 Seat
Education or Workforce Development	1 Seat
Other Funders	1 Seat
<p>Person with Lived Expertise of Homelessness</p> <p>Note: These seats are reserved for people with lived expertise of homelessness, but at all times Membership Council should require that <i>at least</i> one-fourth of its members have lived expertise of homelessness.</p>	2 Seats
<p>Other</p> <p>Note: To ensure maximum representation, the “Other” seats should be reserved for interests not represented, in any manner, by the other Membership Council members, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional homeless response system providers • Unrepresented subpopulations (veterans, youth, domestic violence, LGBT) • Criminal justice (law enforcement, local jails, etc.) • Faith-based community (churches, rescue missions, etc.) • Other partners (incl. utility cooperatives, etc.) 	0 – 4 Seats

Stakeholders not directly represented on the Membership Council will continue to play an important role in effecting change in the CoC. Membership Council meetings will remain open to the general CoC membership and the Membership Council will continue to operate in a transparent manner. In addition, through these recommendations, the committees and workgroups will be empowered and provide forums for ample involvement in the detailed work of ending homelessness in the CoC.

Next Step: Restructuring Membership Council

Current Membership Council should approve the recommendations for restructuring, including the proposed stakeholder categories and number of seats assigned per

category. A **Governance Restructuring Workgroup** can then develop a member selection process to actively recruit potential members to fill each stakeholder seat. The full CoC membership should approve the final slate of members to make up the new Membership Council.

Once the slate of members is selected and seated, all members should be required to participate in a comprehensive onboarding process focused on roles and responsibilities of various bodies within the CoC, the purpose of CoC governance, and relevant HUD CoC Program requirements. All onboarding processes must incorporate and promote authentic engagement of people with lived expertise of homelessness and BIPOC.

Membership Council Role

Membership Council should continue to serve as the HUD-required board for the Austin/Travis County CoC and will maintain primary responsibility for the full range of CoC activities it currently oversees. In this role, the Membership Council will provide high-level oversight and direction-setting to the overall Continuum, while handling three primary HUD-related responsibilities:

- (1) **Operating the CoC**, including: (a) setting Continuum-wide priorities; and (b) assigning written responsibilities to the CoC committees, workgroups, and lead agency, and providing oversight of their efforts.
- (2) **Designating and operating an HMIS**, by setting priorities for and overseeing the work of the HMIS Lead/administrator.
- (3) **Providing high-level oversight of the annual CoC competition**, including providing guidance on incorporation of CoC priorities and approving the CoC Program application prior to submission to HUD.

Other day-to-day responsibilities related to CoC requirements should be delegated to the CoC committees/workgroups and lead agency (see subsequent sections for more details regarding the role and responsibilities of each of these entities).

CoC Roadmap

The purpose of the Membership Council will be to focus on big picture topics and elevate itself above the details of running the CoC. By leveraging the experience and knowledge of the diverse group of stakeholders that comprise its membership, the Membership Council will be poised to lead the CoC, make the important decisions, and drive change in the community.

The best way for the Membership Council to achieve this is through the use of a **CoC Roadmap**.² The Roadmap will become the **guiding document for the work of the CoC**, outlining the CoC's main goals and defining key strategies, objectives, partnerships, expected outcomes, and action items to make progress on each of these goals.

Finding the right fit for how broad the Membership Council's charge should be in efforts to end homelessness in Austin and Travis County can take some careful planning. It is recommended that **one of the first-year Roadmap topics for the CoC be focused on Membership Council's role in Austin homelessness policy**. This process will allow the newly-seated Membership Council time to figure out how best it can address the needs of the CoC within the updated governance structure before considering broadening its scope.

We recommend that the CoC take on a **total of five priority Roadmap topics/goals for the initial year. We propose the following based on community priorities and potential:**

- 1) Clarifying and refining Membership Council's role in the CoC and larger Austin homeless policy, including coordinating and supporting the Austin Action Plan to End Homelessness;
- 2) Increasing diversity and ensuring authentic input from BIPOC and people with lived expertise of homelessness;
- 3) Exploring greater Austin area regional homelessness coordination;
- 4) Updating the Austin Action Plan to End Homelessness; and
- 5) Developing best practices and building expertise around the homeless and housing-stabilization response systems.

Delegation of Authority and Work Plans

Under these recommendations, the CoC's committees and workgroups will be refined to reflect, in many ways, the makeup of the Membership Council and overall CoC stakeholders (see below, CoC Committees and Workgroups). This provides an opportunity for the Membership Council **to delegate, while providing clear direction, to the committees and workgroups** to carry out the bulk of the day-to-day work and decision-making.

One way to make clear the Membership Council's delegation of authority to the committees and workgroups is through **creating work plans for the committees**, based heavily on the CoC's Roadmap.³ The Membership Council should work closely

² Please see *Attachment A: New York City Continuum of Care 2020-2021 Action Plan* for an example of this recommendation.

³ Please see *Attachment B: NYC CoC Workgroup 2021 Work Plan Template* for an example of this recommendation.

with the committees to develop annual work plans defining tasks for the committees (and underlying workgroups) for the year in a manner consistent with the broader objectives of the Roadmap. Having this clear direction from the Membership Council can ensure that the work of the committees and workgroups is coordinated, complementary, and clearly connected to the CoC's overall priorities.

The Membership Council should be empowered to oversee the work of the committees and workgroups. This means that the Membership Council should not only help define the annual undertakings of the committees and workgroups, but also ensure that they are meeting the set objectives. Having **quarterly reviews of the committee work plans** will provide the necessary oversight without overly burdening the Membership Council with details.

To support these efforts to provide adequate oversight to the work of the committees and workgroups, **Membership Council members will be expected to serve on at least one committee or workgroup**. This continuity between the leadership of the CoC and the bodies carrying out the day-to-day work should inspire confidence in decisions, increase accountability, and foster cohesion between the various CoC entities.

Creating this structure of a CoC Roadmap and delegation of authority to the committees/workgroups through work plans will allow the Membership Council to broaden its vision to take a more holistic view of ending homelessness.

Next Step: Developing Roadmap

Once a new Membership Council is selected and seated, it should work to develop a CoC-wide Roadmap, with corresponding committee work plans. This should be one of the first items undertaken by the new Membership Council.

Membership Council Leadership

Strong leadership is essential to ensure the Membership Council is able to provide effective high-level oversight and direction-setting for the CoC. The Membership Council should continue to utilize its current officer structure of electing a Chair and Vice-Chair with set term limits. To bolster the strength of this structure, Membership Council should consciously and deliberately identify and invest in future officers to ensure they build the credentials, confidence, interest, and knowledge they will need to lead. This can include establishing and following a **clear succession plan** for grooming members of the Membership Council to step into these officer positions.

Membership Council Meetings

The Membership Council should hold monthly meetings to ensure that it meets its responsibilities. Special meetings occurring outside of the regular monthly meetings should only be called in emergency situations (e.g. COVID-19 pandemic).

The Membership Council should move away from consensus model for decision making and toward a **majority-rule voting model**, by which all decisions are made by a vote of all present voting members. While seemingly more democratic, the consensus model has historically either delayed decisions from being made or has resulted in unclear direction on implementation. The majority-rule model will help Membership Council make quicker and clearer decisions going forward.

Conflict of Interest

As noted above, HUD requires that CoCs establish a code of conduct and recusal process for its primary decision-making bodies. HUD's requirements make it clear that members may not participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefits to the organization that the member represents.

Historically, the Austin/Travis County CoC has broadly interpreted these conflict requirements and prohibited service providers from participating in many decisions that may impact them, whether or not they are directly related to funding. Going forward, Membership Council should have confidence that its diversified membership and clear voting policies will minimize the ability for providers or selected subgroups from having undue influence on decisions.

If there is concern about a conflict of interest, it should be limited to **areas where decisions are directly related to funding or defunding specific projects** and should only apply to representatives of the funded entity. The concern should be discussed openly at Membership Council or Committees and voted on by all non-conflicted members.

Next Step: Update CoC Governing Documents

The Governance Restructuring Workgroup should update the CoC's governing documents (governance charter, code of conduct, conflict of interest policy, etc.) to operationalize these recommendations and any additional detail agreed upon by the Workgroup.

ECHO

A CoC's lead agency (typically the Collaborative Applicant) plays a key structural role in an effective system of care. HUD only requires the Collaborative Applicant to carry out a few key tasks, including submitting the Consolidated Application in the CoC Program competition, applying for planning funds on behalf of the CoC, and keeping CoC

records. Any additional authority the lead agency has must be delegated to it by the CoC, with these roles and responsibilities clearly outlined in the CoC's governance charter. In most communities, the lead agency acts as a bridge between the various CoC entities, as well as provides administrative support and accountability.

In its role as lead agency for the Austin/Travis County CoC, ECHO staff have expertise in the HUD CoC Program requirements and day-to-day experience of managing the CoC. ECHO should be **formally empowered to act as a strong coordinating body for the CoC**. This can include not only providing administrative support, but also conducting day-to-day management and implementation of much of the work identified in the CoC's Roadmap.

The best way to clearly define ECHO's role is to not only update the CoC's governance charter, but to draft a clear and comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the CoC. The MOU should outline all of ECHO's responsibilities, including **authority to make certain decisions on behalf of the CoC**. The MOU can be similar in nature to ECHO's HMIS Lead MOU, and clearly state expectations, duties, and delegation of authority. Drafting of the MOU can be tasked to a workgroup or committee, but it should ultimately be reviewed and approved by the Membership Council.

It is important to note that representatives for the CoC lead agency are only subject to conflicts of interest where they participate in conversations pertaining to:

- Determining the allocation of funding to the lead agency;
- Selection of organizations to fulfill their particular lead agency role; or
- Performance review of its own agency as it relates to its lead agency activities.

It is not an inherent conflict of interest for ECHO as the lead agency to have a representative on the Membership Council, present to the Membership Council, participate in CoC policy discussions and decisions, hold other CoC Program grants, and/or vote on most CoC matters, so long as ECHO representatives follow the broader CoC conflict of interest policy.

Next Step: Draft MOU between ECHO and CoC

The Membership Council and ECHO should enter into a MOU that establishes ECHO as a key coordinating entity within the CoC, highlighting the areas in which it is delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Membership Council and CoC. The MOU should be drafted by the Governance Restructuring Workgroup to reflect the updated governance charter and accompanying documents (e.g. conflict of interest policy).

CoC Committees and Workgroups

The current committee and workgroup structure in the Austin/Travis County CoC operates in a hierarchical manner. The CoC/ESG and Policy and Planning Committees oversee various related workgroups. All proposed policies and recommendations are funneled up from the workgroups, through the committees, and ultimately decided upon at the Membership Council level.

We recommend that the CoC preserve much of this existing structure but make concerted efforts to **be more intentional about the composition of and delegation to the committees and workgroups**. All work being done at the committee and workgroup level will be guided by the Membership Council's annual Roadmap and corresponding committee work plans (discussed above).

Committees

Under the new structure, the committees hold more inherent decision-making authority, acting as more formal policy-change bodies.⁴ Using the collective expertise of their members, **committees will be empowered to make certain decisions on behalf of the CoC** in alignment with the CoC Roadmap and corresponding work plans.

This will require committees to have a **set voting membership, ideally mirroring the composition of the Membership Council in terms of varied stakeholder representation and diversity** (including members with lived expertise of homelessness). Each committee **must have at least one Membership Council member as part of its voting membership**. Committees should employ a **majority-rule voting model of decision making** when acting on those issues on which they have specifically been delegated authority.

Similar to Membership Council, decisions made at the committee level will be transparent; limiting committee membership need not preclude participation in discussion by other individuals or organizations: non-member individuals and organizations should be permitted to attend committee meetings as appropriate to provide additional information or perspectives. Committees will continue to use publicly-available agendas and meeting minutes to clearly identify when and how decisions are made.

In addition to the existing committees (CoC/ESG and Policy and Practice) we recommend the CoC create at least one, potentially two, new committees. The CoC would benefit from the addition of a **Performance and Monitoring Committee**. This committee would be charged with overseeing the CoC Program competition, including local scoring policy. In addition, the CoC should consider creating a **Coordinated Entry**

⁴ Please see *Attachment C: Policy Change vs. Networking Group Slide*, for distinction between Policy Change and Networking groups.

(CE) Committee to make data-informed decisions related to CE and evaluate, monitor and strategically adjust CE policies and operations.

Workgroups

The workgroups will function more as networking bodies⁵ for the CoC and provide forums for topical subject-matter experts to work together to expand their knowledge, discuss issues, and problem solve. They will be tasked by their corresponding committees to discuss and provide recommendations, through consensus decision-making, to the committees for a decision. Workgroup membership can be more fluid, without a set number of voting members, but should strive to incorporate voices of BIPOC and people with lived expertise of homelessness as much as possible.

The CoC should work to **streamline the number of workgroups** wherever possible. Proliferation of unnecessary workgroups complicates the organizational structure of the CoC and creates inefficiencies within the decision-making process. The CoC should regularly review the role/responsibilities of each workgroup to ensure that all existing workgroups are necessary, unique and not duplicative of work performed by other workgroups, and are in alignment with and truly support the work of the CoC Roadmap and overall efforts to end homelessness, including the Austin Action Plan to End Homelessness.

The CoC should also consider whether some of the existing workgroups can operate on more of an **ad hoc basis**, and not be a standing workgroup. Certain workgroups, such as the PIT Count Workgroup, have very set, time-limited charges, and may function better as an ad hoc group that comes together only to address a certain issue and then sunset.

Next Steps: Committee Restructuring

The new Membership Council should convene the current co-chairs of the CoC/ESG and Policy and Practice Committee and any potential chairs for the proposed Performance and Monitoring Committee and (potential) CE Committee. This group should work to **examine and reorder the committees and workgroups and their related responsibilities** given the proposed changes to the overall structure. Issues to consider include:

- Whether the range of subjects covered by existing committees and workgroups is sufficient to address the range of day-to-day operations necessary to perform CoC activities and meet the long-term goals of the CoC contained in the Roadmap, including:

⁵ Please see *Attachment C: Policy Change vs. Networking Group Slide*, for distinction between Policy Change and Networking groups.

- How should the scope of the existing committees and workgroups be changed?
- Should existing workgroups be eliminated?
- Should new workgroups be created?
- Whether existing committees and workgroups are adequately performing their role and poised to meet the responsibilities outlined in the Roadmap.
- Whether the composition of certain workgroup membership needs to be realigned to meet the needs of the CoC.
- How meeting operations will need to shift to provide the necessary structure and transparency to foster buy-in and trust in the decision-making processes.

Timeline and Proposed Next Steps

Body/Group	Date/Timeframe	Task Description
<u>Membership Council</u>	February 1, 2021 meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vote to approve the initial Homebase recommendations to be used to instruct and guide ongoing work needed for formalize and operationalize changes. ● Approve the creation of an ad hoc Governance Restructuring Workgroup and empower the workgroup with authority to operationalize recommendations (see tasks below) ● Approve the slate of members for the ad hoc Governance Restructuring Workgroup
	February – April 2021	Membership Council continues to act as the primary decision-making body for the CoC while the Governance Restructuring Workgroup completes its tasks
	March 1, 2021	Recommended Action: Membership Council authorize an ad hoc CoC NOFA Committee to prepare for 2021 CoC NOFA Competition
<u>Governance Restructuring Workgroup (w/</u>	February - March 2021	Design a member selection process and accompanying application for new Membership Council using the Governance Recommendations/Feedback documents.

<u>Homebase support)</u>	March 2021	Recruit for and open member application/selection process for the new Membership Council
	March – April 2021	Using the Governance Recommendations document, associated public comments and accompanying attachments as a guide, make/flesh out decisions related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss appropriate name for the new Membership Council • Clarifying and refining the new Membership Council's role and purpose (Roadmap Topic 1) [see p. 10-11] • Committee/workgroup restructuring [see p. 14-16] • Role of general CoC membership (i.e. coalition/members/stakeholders) • Clarify role of ECHO Board
	March – April 2021	Update/draft proposed Governance Charter and accompanying Conflict of Interest Policy to reflect recommendations/workgroup decisions
	March – April 2021	Using recommendations and proposed governance charter as a guide, draft proposed MOU between the new Membership Council and ECHO to take effect after new Membership Council is seated
	April 2021	Following the member selection process, select a proposed slate of members for new Membership Council
<u>Austin/Travis County CoC</u>	April 2021	Full CoC membership/stakeholders meeting to approve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated governance charter • Proposed slate of new Membership Council members selected by the Governance Restructuring Workgroup
<u>New Membership Council</u>	May 2021	Hold first meeting as the primary decision-making body for the CoC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select Chair/Co-Chair

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve/sign MOU with ECHO • Orientation/onboarding for all new members, including emphasis on authentic engagement of people with lived expertise of homelessness
	June - July 2021	Building on the Governance Restructuring Workgroup's efforts, develop 2021-2022 CoC Roadmap
	August 2021	Create corresponding work plans for each committee based on approved Roadmap
	2021-2022	Monitor committee workplans on a quarterly basis

NEW YORK CITY CONTINUUM OF CARE (NYC COC)

2020-2021 ACTION PLAN



SEPTEMBER 2020

BACKGROUND

The business of the NYC Continuum of Care (CoC) is managed by a Steering Committee which consists of government partners, coalitions, people with lived experience, consumer advocates, homeless services and housing providers, and industry stakeholder members, together with the three co-chairs. In August 2019, the NYC CoC Steering Committee adopted a new Governance Structure with the goal of improving the efficiency and efficacy of the CoC. The newly formed Steering Committee manages the Continuum with a goal of supporting

NYC's efforts to prevent and eradicate homelessness in NYC, effectively manage the grants of the NYC CoC, and is responsible for implementing a strategic plan towards those aims.

From April to June 2020, the NYC CoC Steering Committee worked with Homebase/The Center for Common Concerns to conduct goal setting and define five key action areas for the NYC CoC Steering Committee to focus on in 2020 and 2021. This 2020-2021 NYC CoC Steering Committee Action Plan defines key strategies, objectives, collaborative partnerships, expected outcomes, and action plans to make progress on each of these action areas. The action areas and subsequent action plans were developed within the context of COVID-19 response and recovery and are designed to be accomplished by December 2021.

2020-2021 ACTION AREAS IDENTIFIED

The five action areas identified by the NYC CoC Steering Committee for 2020 – 2021 are as follows:

- 1) **Continuity of Operations Planning:** COVID-19, as well as the economic hardships associated with it, have tested systems and providers to their limits. How do we ensure that processes to access CoC funded projects are robust and flexible enough to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness in times of crisis? What existing waivers and flexibilities have we implemented in response to the COVID-19 crisis that we should make permanent?
- 2) **Lived Experience:** How do we, as a Steering Committee, operate in a manner that incorporates the voices of those with past and current lived experience of homelessness in a meaningful and productive way? Where are we falling short on this goal?
- 3) **Teamwork:** How do we leverage our new NYC CoC Structure in a way that maximizes cooperation, efficiency, and communication among our committees, agencies, staff, and those we are serving? How do we ensure broader participation to develop staff expertise and leadership?
- 4) **Improve CoC Performance and Maximize Current Funding:** We may be facing budget shortfalls, both locally and federally, again soon. Are we prepared as a Steering Committee to make tough recommendations in funding prioritization? Are there things we can do to preemptively reallocate, streamline or maximize funding now? How do we address current underspending by grantees and system performance issues that impact our funding? How can we look at grant performance on a more regular basis to more pro-actively address issues such as occupancy and utilization?
- 5) **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion:** How can we proactively ensure that diversity, equity, and inclusion guide all operations of the CoC, including Steering Committee membership, decision-making processes, and representation among CoC-funded agencies and their leadership structures?

ACTION AREA #1: CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING

The COVID-19 public health and economic crisis has resulted in a great deal of uncertainty for persons experiencing homelessness and the homeless response system, including the CoC and CoC-funded organizations. COVID-19 has highlighted the need for greater resiliency and continuity of operations planning within the CoC in order to quickly and effectively respond to the ongoing COVID-19 crisis, as well as to plan for future crises impacting persons experiencing homelessness. Economic pressures that strain the ability of clients to pay rent have also created

concerns regarding the solvency of CoC-funded housing. The current pandemic has also resulted in the implementation of new flexibilities and efficiencies for serving clients, such as the expansion of remote service options. The CoC would like to ensure that these positive systems changes are operationalized and maintained beyond the current crisis.

STRATEGY	Utilize the lessons learned from the COVID-19 crisis to develop and operationalize changes to CoC operations that allow for greater flexibility and a more resilient housing system. Adopt strategies to ensure continuity of operations and address solvency concerns for CoC-funded organizations.
OBJECTIVE	Create supports for CoC projects and access to housing dedicated to the homeless during these unstable times
OWNER OF STRATEGY	Michael Collins (Lead), Kevin Thrun, Kelly O’Sullivan + DSS Federal Homeless Policy and Reporting (FHPR)
COLLABORATION	CoC-funded organizations; Coordinated Assessment and Placement System (CAPS) Steering Committee; health care system; public health department; homeless and social services department, emergency management, persons w/lived experience, supportive housing providers
EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Implementation of improved flexibilities and responsiveness within the housing system for future crises, including subsequent COVID-19 outbreaks.

ACTION PLAN

<p>Document lessons learned by key stakeholders during the initial COVID-19 crisis response.</p> <p>Target end: 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a small workgroup including diverse representatives from the CoC, CoC-funded organizations and providers, health/public health, homeless and social services departments, emergency management, and persons with lived experience to discuss lessons learned from COVID-19. • Facilitate a series of meetings around specific lessons learned, including such topics as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Housing access ○ Coordinated Assessment and Placement Systems (CAPS) ○ Continuity of supportive services, including during isolation or quarantine of clients and/or staff ○ Equity and experiences of subpopulations of persons experiencing homelessness ○ Address “digital divide” – need for both hardware and data plans for formerly homeless tenants ○ Food access – what systems are in place or can be created to ensure those who can’t leave their apartments have access to food • Document COVID-19 lessons learned and develop process for continuous updates as COVID-19 response and recovery proceeds.
<p>Evaluate and explore flexibilities within CAPS for prioritizing and rapidly housing persons experiencing homelessness in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with CAPS Committee to identify the overlap between people at high risk of health complications due to COVID-19 who are residing in congregate settings, non-congregate shelter, or unsheltered situations and those being prioritized for permanent supportive housing (PSH) • Analyze housing placement data from before and during the COVID-19 crisis to identify who is accessing housing. Apply a race and equity lens to this analysis.

<p>response to crisis situations.</p> <p>Target End: 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop recommendations for emergency response protocols for CAPS prioritization and housing response based on discussions and data analysis resulting from COVID-19 crisis. • Look at processes that have been developed in response to COVID-19 which are more client-centered and determine what would be needed to adopt them long term.
<p>Improve and strengthen relationships with the health system and other partners to provide a more streamlined, coordinated emergency response in the future.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage new partnerships with public health, emergency management, and other partners assisting in COVID-19 response to engage in longer-term collaborative relationships around homelessness. • Develop and provide resources and training to health and other partners on the CoC and the homeless and housing response system in NYC. • Invite representatives from the health system, emergency management, and other partners to participate in CoC meetings, including ongoing planning meetings around COVID-19 response and recovery.
<p>Preserve existing CoC housing portfolio in light of reduction in program revenue due to COVID-19.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and PSH providers to project reductions in revenue due to COVID-19 and projected impact on housing, services, and number of clients served. • Utilize information provided by CoC-funded RRH and PSH providers to advocate for additional local, state, federal and private funding assistance for these programs, including new COVID-19 resources such as ESG-CV and CDBG-CV.

ACTION AREA #2: LIVED EXPERIENCE

The NYC CoC Steering Committee has identified its work to bring the voices of people with lived experience into the CoC’s work and decision-making processes as a current strength. However, the Steering Committee also recognizes the importance in continuing to strengthen and elevate the voices of persons with lived experience in a more formalized and proactive manner. This includes providing additional opportunities for persons with lived experience to participate in decision-making processes, offering training and appropriate supports for representatives with lived experience, and engaging in broader efforts to proactively engage persons with lived experience.

STRATEGY	Formalize proactive policies to inclusively and equitably engage persons with current and lived experience of homelessness in CoC decision-making processes.
OBJECTIVE	Ensure that there is representation from at least one person with lived experience of homelessness on each CoC Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups.
COLLABORATION	Persons with Lived Experience Committee; Youth Action Board (YAB); CoC Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups; Housing Works
OWNER OF STRATEGY	Cameron Craig (Lead), YAB Lead - TBD, Jamie Powlovich (Lead Ally) + Housing Works + Cadija Tibbs (FHPR)

EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Persons with lived experience are more authentically, equitably, consistently, and proactively engaged in CoC decision-making processes. Participation in CoC processes by persons with lived experience is consistent and stable because representatives are appropriated supported.
-------------------	---

ACTION PLAN

<p>Ensure equitable representation of persons with lived experience on all CoC Work Groups, Standing Committees, and other decision-making bodies.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement plan for improved representation of persons with lived experience on the CAPS Steering Committee. • Ensure that authentic engagement of persons with lived experience is a goal for all CoC Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representation of at least one representative with lived experience on each Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup by the end of 2020. ○ Work with Persons with Lived Experience Committee to identify any changes to Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup structure to more intentionally engage and include persons with lived experience. • Obtain feedback on ways to make the CoC a more welcoming environment for persons with lived experience from CoC clients, providers, and the Persons with Lived Experience Committee. • Work with CoC-funded organizations and Persons with Lived Experience together to develop policies to include persons with lived experience of homelessness on the Board of Directors of their agencies. • Engage all CoC representatives around sitting in equal partnership with persons with lived experience and being open to their advocacy.
<p>Provide appropriate support, mentorship, and compensation for persons with lived experience to engage in authentic decision-making and advocacy.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop formal on-boarding curriculum and offer trainings to CoC Steering Committee, Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup members with lived experience to amplify their voices, including trainings on advocacy, leadership, funding streams, and the homeless and housing response system. • Develop mentorship program and plan to recruit persons with lived experience to participate in the CoC and provide guidance in learning about the homeless response system and CoC processes. • Develop clear policies regarding fair compensation of time for persons with lived experience engaged in CoC decision-making processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with persons with lived experience to identify preferred method(s) of payment (ex: stipend, gift cards), including considerations for how different forms of payment may impact mainstream benefits. ○ Define different compensation pathways for persons participating in CoC decision-making processes on ad hoc basis versus full-time participation. • Develop clear description of expectations of participation and time commitment for persons with lived experience who participate in CoC decision-making processes. • Share information on how to leverage and translate work with the CoC Steering Committee into a profession in the field of homelessness or other advocacy.
<p>Expand opportunities and forums for proactively engaging with persons with lived experience.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate more diverse forums for input, such surveys and focus groups, for persons with lived experience to provide feedback to the CoC. • Establish and market the Persons with Lived Experience Committee as a safe forum for clients with lived experience to share feedback in confidence and have their concerns escalated to the CoC. • Partner with agencies that have seen success in mobilizing persons with lived experience (ex: Voices of Community Activists & Leaders - New York) to learn

	from them and implement new strategies for proactive engagement of persons with lived experience of homelessness.
--	---

ACTION AREA #3: TEAMWORK

The adoption of a new governance structure for the NYC CoC brings with it new opportunities to think about coordination across components of the CoC to most efficiently and effectively respond to the needs of clients and providers. It is important that under this new structure, each CoC Committee and Work Group sees where their work fits in with the larger work and mission of the CoC and that there are clear channels of communication across different parts of the CoC structure and decision-making processes. This change in governance structure also creates new opportunities to build the capacity of the CoC Steering Committee and implement new processes to develop the experience and expertise among newer members.

STRATEGY	Clearly identify roles and responsibilities of each CoC Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup, with purposeful review of membership, purpose, coordination channels, and opportunities to build member capacity.
OBJECTIVE	Develop and/or document each Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup mini-action plan for the first half of 2021.
COLLABORATION	CoC Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups
OWNER OF STRATEGY	William Lang (Lead), Alyson Zikmund + Emma Cathell (FHPR)
EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Each CoC Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup has a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities within the CoC. Activities and communication are coordinated between CoC Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups.

ACTION PLAN

Develop CoC Work Group mini-action plans for 2021. Target End: 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebase will assist each Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup to develop a mini-action plan or document their existing plan into a similar format that can be reviewed by the Steering Committee. • Review mini-action plans to coordinate goals and strategies across Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups to prevent duplication of efforts. • Establish schedule for check-ins with each group to discuss progress on their action plans and troubleshoot any issues that arise.
Formalize best practices in coordination and communication processes across Work Groups. Target End: 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways in which coordination between the Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups can organically occur and formalize/document these methods. • Survey Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroups to identify existing barriers and challenges to coordination and communication across groups. Utilize this feedback to develop new strategies to improve coordination.
Increase rotation among Steering Committee and Work Group members to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify strategies to increase rotation and turnover among CoC Steering Committee, Committees, Subcommittees, and Workgroup members (ex: establishing term limits for membership) and build leadership capacity among new members.

engage new staff and build member capacity. Target End: 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement best practices to allow new staff/members to shadow experienced members and build their knowledge around CoC processes and operations. • Explore workshops and training opportunities to build capacity among CoC Steering Committee, Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup members.
---	--

ACTION AREA #4: IMPROVE COC PERFORMANCE ON CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

The significant need for housing among persons experiencing homelessness alongside limited housing and resource capacity makes it essential for the CoC to maximize existing funding in order to serve as many clients as possible in effective programs to meet their needs. This is a particular need during COVID-19 response and recovery, as the CoC expects to face even greater client need and resources constraints due to the economic impacts of COVID-19. The NYC CoC Steering Committee has identified a need to address performance more frequently than just during the CoC Program Competition and current underspending and underperformance by grantees as key issues that impact the ability of the CoC to maximize current resources and effectively serve clients.

STRATEGY	Implement new procedures to work with CoC grantees to address underspending and underperformance in their grant-funded programs and improve competitiveness of the CoC in the annual CoC Program Competition.
OBJECTIVE	<p>See a year-over-year reduction in underspent funds from 2019 to 2020 & 2021 by x%.</p> <p>Work with providers to ensure that projects maintain high occupancy rates and monitor on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>Ensure that new projects are operating within x months of contract award.</p>
COLLABORATION	CoC grantees; government funders; Performance Management and Quality Improvement Committee
OWNER OF STRATEGY	Howard Charton (Lead), Tierra Labrada, Robin Crawford-Wilder + Performance Management Committee
EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Increased understanding of methods for spending down funds, performance measures, and the impact of underspending and underperformance on the CoC. Improved NYC CoC Performance in annual CoC Program Competition.

ACTION PLAN

Improve provider understanding around spend down and performance measures. Target End: 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide one-on-one assistance to providers with demonstrated histories of underspending to provide information on options for spend down (e.g. overleasing). • Work with government funders and providers to change perceptions of CoC funding as “gap fill” funding and to increase understanding of CoC funding as an important part of the continuum of homeless response resources. • Use crisis points identified during COVID-19 to help providers think about spending in a more strategic way.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create onboarding guidance for new grantees to ensure projects start on time and rent up in a timely manner.
<p>Develop a process for addressing and remediating significant underspending and underperformance by CoC grantees.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a formal process for notifying provider points of contact about underspending and performance concerns more regularly, with escalation to provider CEO if problem persists. • Establish a threshold for grant spenddown and project performance for all CoC grantees. Require escalation to the PQI Committee for those grantees that do not meet threshold. • Involve PQI Committee in meeting with all grantees who do not meet spending or performance thresholds. • Engage with PQI Committee around working with the 5 lowest performing projects and 5 projects with the most significant underspending to develop Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs).
<p>Improve NYC CoC Performance in the annual CoC Program Competition.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule dedicated meeting of the CoC Steering Committee to discuss CoC competition review and rank processes, reallocation of funds, and prioritization of new projects vs. existing projects that are underperforming. • Review 2018 and 2019 NOFA Debriefing documents and develop an action plan for improving scores for the five High Priority CoC Application Questions where the CoC is most significantly and consistently underperforming.

ACTION AREA #5: DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION

Homelessness reflects comprehensive, intersectional inequities across institutions and systems that disproportionately impact people of color. The NYC CoC Steering Committee is dedicated to proactively and authentically implementing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) practices throughout all aspects of the CoC, including Steering Committee membership and representation among CoC-funded agencies and their leadership structures. The NYC CoC Steering Committee will also work to identify resources to support understanding and implementation of DEI practices and policies among the CoC Steering Committee, Work Group members and CoC-funded agencies.

STRATEGY	Expand implementation of DEI practices and access to DEI resources throughout the CoC, including within the CoC Steering Committee and CoC-funded agencies.
OBJECTIVE	CoC Steering Committee will have increased representation from communities of color, LGBTQ+, and/or other populations disproportionality impacted by homelessness. All newly elected members of the CoC will have been on-boarded into the work of the CoC in a way to ensure their success.
COLLABORATION	CoC grantees; local DEI experts and trainers; Persons with Lived Experience Committee; Youth Action Board (YAB)
OWNER OF STRATEGY	Jessica Jeavons (Lead), John Rojas, Patricia Hernandez + DSS FHPR
EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Increased DEI understanding among CoC Steering Committee, Work Groups, and CoC-funded agencies. Increased DEI among CoC Steering Committee members and CoC Program leadership. Issue DEI statement for CoC that clearly defines what DEI means for CoC

ACTION PLAN

<p>Analysis of the CoC and the outcomes of clients served through a DEI lens</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create workgroup to define updated and expanded racial disparity analysis of the CoC • Execute the expanded racial disparity analysis (both quantitative and qualitative) • Utilize the analysis to guide next steps for addressing disparities and determine if further data collection needs to be done at various points in the process.
<p>Provide access to DEI resources and training opportunities for CoC Steering Committee members and CoC-funded agencies.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey CoC Steering Committee members and CoC-funded agencies to identify areas of needed support and understanding around DEI policies and practices. • Work with local experts, Persons with Lived Experience Committee, and YAB to identify and offer DEI resources and training opportunities to CoC Steering Committee members and CoC-funded agencies. • Establish regular evaluation process to identify CoC successes and challenges around implementation of DEI policies and procedures.
<p>Increase DEI among CoC Steering Committee membership, CoC-funded agencies and CoC project leadership.</p> <p>Target End: 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a mission statement and action plan for DEI-based outreach and recruitment of CoC Steering Committee, Committee, Subcommittee, and Workgroup members. • Outreach to more organizations that focus on serving populations of color, LGBTQ+, and other populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness to apply for CoC funding. • Work with CoC-funded agencies to analyze Board composition and increase Board diversity, as appropriate.

Attachment B: NYC CoC Workgroup 2021 Work Plan Template

COC WORKGROUP 2021 WORK PLAN TEMPLATE

NYC CoC Work Groups are strongly encouraged to develop a work plan, and submit it to cathellemm@dss.nyc.gov so their work can be coordinated across all work groups. This template gives possible ideas for incorporation into the work plan.

AREA #1: REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN & DEVELOP COMMITTEE GOALS

1. Review the 2020/2021 Steering Committee Action Plan with your team. Find areas of alignment with your current work, identify committees where cross-team work is required.
2. What Action Areas align with your committee's scope of work? Use them to identify possible 2021 goals for your committee / subcommittees listed below.
3. This action plan is a living document, are there areas you feel need additional tasks listed out?
4. Do you have clear cross-representation on Steering Committee and CAPS? If not, identify who will fill this role.

AREA #2: REVIEW WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

1. Develop clear work plan for each C/S-C that: has a refined membership list (paring down those that don't attend), tasks groups to find gaps in their new membership roster, incorporates equity and diversity, and doesn't lean on the same people year after year to run
2. Identify strategies to increase rotation and turnover your Committees, Subcommittees, and/or Workgroup members (ex: establishing term limits for membership) and build leadership capacity among new members.
3. Identify one member who is responsible for taking the meeting notes and sending to DSS, if not one of the committee co-chairs.

2021 ACTION PLAN FOR [ENTER NAME OF COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE, AND WORKGROUP]

Task One:	
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Actions needed]
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Actions needed]
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Actions needed]

Task Two:	
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Actions needed]

[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Actions needed]
------------------------------------	--

Task Three:	
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Actions needed]
[enter task] Target End: [date]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Actions needed]

Attachment C: Policy Change vs. Networking Group Slide

The below slide was presented to CoC stakeholders at governance trainings held on December 15th and 16th, 2020. It provides context for distinguishing between Policy Change entities (Membership Council, Committees) and Networking entities (Workgroups).

II. Overview of Federal Requirements and Governance Best Practices: Framework

Policy Change:

1. Make decisions
2. Elevate from the details
3. Focus on big picture topics
4. Disagree
5. Bring in outside experts, but are not comprised wholly of them
6. Are comprised of partners that wouldn't naturally work together

Networking:

1. Discuss problems
2. Focus on the details
3. Explore an issue in great detail
4. Agree
5. Are comprised of the subject matter experts
6. Work together, use the group to network and expand their knowledge