

---

# OPTIONS ANALYSIS

## NASHVILLE CONTINUUM OF CARE

FEBRUARY 2, 2017



# AGENDA

1. Review how Nashville will make changes to your leadership and management structures
2. Introduce 3 DRAFT structural options
3. Community Discussion

REMINDER: These are draft options; nothing is decided,  
these are designed to encourage conversation

**\*\*\* NO DECISIONS ARE BEING MADE AT THIS MEETING \*\*\***

## REMINDER: HUD TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- WHO WE ARE: Consultants who support communities in their planning to end homelessness
- WHAT WE DO: Work with all relevant stakeholders to strengthen the community's homeless system
- PRIORITIES FOR NASHVILLE: Improve governance and structure to prevent and end homelessness
- TIMELINE: Initial engagement runs through July 2017; can easily be extended to support implementation of new structure



# GOVERNANCE CHARTER



## WHO MAKES UP THE CONTINUUM OF CARE?

Continuum of Care membership is:

- More than HUD funded homeless service providers
- ALL homeless service providers
- ALL programs and agencies that interact with persons experiencing homelessness
- YOU

# GOVERNANCE & STRUCTURE

Important considerations:

- Nashville is considering making significant changes in the management and leadership of its homeless services.
- In order for a CoC to change its structure in a major way, it's best for the CoC membership to vote on restructuring its homeless service and planning system.
- However, Nashville's CoC membership rules are unbounded and undefined; there is no clarity re: who would be eligible to vote on an important issue such as a new governing/management structure.

# HOW DOES A CONTINUUM OF CARE MAKE CHANGES TO ITS MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES?

A clear and comprehensive governance charter articulates how a community:

- Designates CoC membership and voting rights
- Committee structure
- CoC Board composition
- Collaborative Applicant and HMIS lead
- How decisions are made

## GOVERNANCE UNDERGIRDS A GREAT DEAL

- A CoC's Governance Charter and By-Laws reflect agreed-upon decisions about CoC Board composition, leadership and decision making authority.
- With stronger governance, whichever Structural Option is eventually adopted will already have a functioning leadership and governing structure in place .....

**... allowing the CoC to move more quickly into strategic priority setting, resource development, and data-driven planning.**



## GOVERNANCE UNDERGIRDS A GREAT DEAL

Agreeing on and formalizing new requirements in a Governance Charter is critical as the CoC evolves:

- Important to have in place to vote on major structural changes
- Will support leadership decision-making going forward
- Scorable element on the CoC NOFA

# REVISITING GOVERNANCE CHARTER WHILE CONSIDERING STRUCTURE

- The work of revising the Governance Charter and By-Laws doesn't have to take a long time.
- Evaluation and exploration of structural options will be an iterative process, and can begin immediately.
- The two processes can run simultaneously.
- The Governance Charter **MUST** be in place before changes can be made to your structure.
- Both will proceed with open access for community participants and observers.

HUD TA is here to support you through the redesign of your Governance Charter and consideration of new structural options



# COMMUNITY FEEDBACK



# INCORPORATING COMMUNITY FEEDBACK IN OPTIONS

## WHAT WE LEARNED FROM YOU:

### ***Concerns with Capacity in Management***

- CoC needs more support
  - Deep capacity issues at Collaborative Applicant & HMIS Lead
- General support for the staff working at MHC and MDHA, but not enough coordination or capacity
- Working hard just to meet minimum compliance standards
- Not able to work to excel and improve functionality of CoC
- Service providers need more training, support, guidance

# INCORPORATE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK IN OPTIONS

## ***Concerns with leadership***

- Wait, who's in charge again? Unclear on who makes decisions on leadership
- Commission meetings do not produce results or change; Governance Committee (CoC Board) is too narrow and only works on the application
- Unclear on mission and vision of the CoC
- Don't make data informed decisions
- Don't feel full commitment of City/unclear on Mayoral leadership

## WHAT WE COMMUNICATED TO GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP:

If government is serious about managing and leading on the issue of homelessness in Nashville, you will need to demonstrate commitment to persons experiencing homelessness and service providers by bringing in new resources, new organizational design and new commitments to the Continuum of Care.



# OPTIONS ANALYSIS



## REMINDER: ROLES LEGISLATED FOR THE COC

- **CoC Board (LEADERSHIP):** decision-making body for the CoC
- **Collaborative Applicant (MANAGEMENT):** eligible applicant that has been designated by the CoC to apply for a grant for CoC planning funds on behalf of the CoC
- **HMIS Lead (DATA):** designated by the CoC may apply for CoC program funds to establish and operate the CoC's HMIS



## OPTION 1-NONPROFIT ENTITY

CoC Board	Collaborative Applicant	HMIS Lead
Community re-constitutes a new Board based on the Governance Charter requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Form a new nonprofit. In preparation for 2017 NOFA, identify an entity to <i>incubate</i> the new nonprofit for a 2-3 year timeframe</li></ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Find an existing nonprofit to take on the Collaborative Applicant role as its distinct NEW role</li></ul>	New nonprofit becomes HMIS Lead

# OPTION I-NONPROFIT ENTITY ANALYSIS

CoC BOARD		COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT		HMIS LEAD	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Might bring new energy to the issue	-Already have so many great groups meeting on homelessness---what do we do with all of them? Who does the actual work of creating a new Board?	Might bring new energy to the issue	-Need to make new relationships with City, Philanthropy, Service providers  -May take a long time to get going; need to develop strategy to prevent CoC from losing momentum	Might bring new energy to the issue	It may be hard to find to find an entity that would take this on during nonprofit formation or as an incubator
Deep trust issues not present	Will a new CoC Board carry any respect and authority locally? How much time will this take to build and can we afford to wait?	Opportunities for private fundraising	-HUD will weigh in on the ability of a new entity to become a Collaborative Applicant		Concerns that transition may slow momentum in meeting HUD's ongoing stringent requirements.
	CoC under nonprofit must operate 2 Boards—the CoC Board and a nonprofit board		-Often requires large, multi-year investment in private resources to support start up costs for the new nonprofit and/or incubation costs while new nonprofit is formed		

## OPTION 1-NONPROFIT ENTITY

### REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS

- Private support is essential to fund transition; is there a local champion with deep pockets to lead this?
- Transitioning to a nonprofit can take a long time; CoC must identify people and organizations responsible for effectuating transition and continue work during the transition
- Find the right trusted partner(s) to lead efforts to form new relationships with government, business, philanthropy
- Acknowledge that this process could take a long time

## OPTION 2-FOCUS STRATEGIES RECOMMENDATION

CoC Board	Collaborative Applicant	HMIS Lead
Metropolitan Homeless Commission (MHC) becomes CoC Board	MHC becomes Collaborative Applicant	MHC becomes HMIS Lead

# OPTION 2-FOCUS STRATEGIES RECOMMENDATION ANALYSIS

CoC BOARD		COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT		HMIS LEAD	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
-MHC carries respect as leader on homelessness (FS)	-MHC's ordinance would need to be re-constituted to accommodate HEARTH requirements	-MHC carries respect as leader on homelessness (FS)	-MHC does not have a history of managing HUD grants	-MHC carries respect as leader on homelessness (FS)	-MHC does not have a history with managing an HMIS; it may be a learning curve
-MHC viewed as visionary agent (FS)		-MHC staff appear to be trusted in the community	-HUD will weigh in on the ability of MHC to become a Collaborative Applicant		-Concern over transparency and accountability when one entity serves as leadership AND manager
	-Concern over transparency and accountability when one entity serves as leadership AND manager		-Concern over transparency and accountability when one entity serves as leadership AND manager		

## OPTION 2-FOCUS STRATEGIES RECOMMENDATION

### REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS

- The Governance Charter should address issues of transparency and accountability that arise from centralizing all aspects of leadership and management in one entity
  - Issues of conflict of interest arise when designating oneself as Collaborative Applicant and HMIS lead
- MHC would need to increase capacity to take on HUD compliance requirements quickly
- MHC would need to consider shifting direct service activities to other entities: Collaborative Applicants often choose not to operate programs that compete with local agencies for funding; viewed as conflict of interest

## OPTION 3-STRENGTHS BASED MODEL

CoC Board	Collaborative Applicant	HMIS Lead
<p>Metropolitan Homeless Commission (MHC) becomes CoC Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-To the maximum extent possible consolidate the work of existing leadership groups into new committees of the Board to reduce duplication of effort</li></ul>	<p>MDHA retains Collaborative Applicant but only under an enhanced staffing model and locally driven expanded responsibilities</p>	<p>MDHA retains HMIS Lead with enhanced capacity and staffing model</p>

# OPTION 3-REORGANIZE AND ENHANCE EXISTING STRUCTURES FOR SUCCESS - ANALYSIS

CoC BOARD		COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT		HMIS LEAD	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS	BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
-MHC carries respect as leader on homelessness (FS)	-MHC's ordinance would need to be re-constituted to accommodate HEARTH requirements	-MDHA has a strong reputation in compliance which could be beneficial when the CoC applies for other federal funds	-MDHA is understaffed; existing capacity issues exist	-MDHA has had this role since 2008; can hit the ground running with enhancing the role; understands requirements	-MDHA is understaffed; existing capacity issues exist
-MHC was founded as a leadership entity to oversee 10 year plan		-Housing is essential to end homelessness; MDHA brings significant housing resources and controls the majority of housing resources in Nashville; keeping homelessness under housing is logical	-Trust and responsiveness issues exist		-Trust and responsiveness issues exist
-MHC seen as visionary agent on homelessness (FS)					



## OPTION 3-STRENGTHS BASED MODEL

### REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS

Significant housing resources exist at MDHA which are important to ending homelessness. MDHA must demonstrate their commitment to vulnerable populations by

- Dedicating housing resources to prevent and end homelessness
- Leverage important local relationships and resources to increase housing stock/access

## OPTION 3-STRENGTHS BASED MODEL

### REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS

MDHA should develop a separate division focusing on homelessness to demonstrate priority and focus on the area

- Other homeless requirements should be consolidated under the enhanced Collaborative Applicant to leverage resources and support planning. This would include Winter Planning, local initiatives, **GUIDED** by MHC as the CoC Board
- Staffing capacity must be expanded to meet compliance requirements and to implement broader policy;
  - Consolidate all homeless staff under MDHA

## OPTION 3-STRENGTHS BASED MODEL

### REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS

- No CoC is successful at ending homelessness using only HUD funds
- MHC was created by Metro government to demonstrate real commitment to homelessness. If MHC is designated as the CoC Board (leadership & decision making entity) for the CoC, the City should also think about what investments it will make to better leverage funds, fill gaps in funding to create a stronger CoC
- MHC will also need to take a leadership role in courting private funds (philanthropy & business), advocacy and priority setting.



# DISCUSSION



## REVIEW OF DRAFT STRUCTURAL OPTIONS:

Option	Elements	Organizational Responsibilities
<b><u>Option 1:</u></b> <b>Nonprofit Management</b>	CoC Board: Collab App: HMIS Lead:	New Nonprofit Board AND New CoC Board New management entity to carry out New management entity to carry out
<b><u>Option 2:</u></b> <b>Focus Strategies Recommendation</b>	CoC Board: Collab App: HMIS Lead:	MHC serves as CoC Board (revise ordinance to meet HEARTH) MHC increases capacity and staff to support management MHC increases capacity and staff to support management
<b><u>Option 3:</u></b> <b>Strengths Based Model</b>	CoC Board: Collab App: HMIS Lead:	MHC serves as CoC Board (revise ordinance to meet HEARTH) MDHA increases staff to support/enhance management MDHA increases staff to support/enhance management

## DISCUSSION

These options were drafted to start the community's conversation.

- What questions do you want more information about?
- Does anything emerge as a general theme of opportunity or concern?
- Which options do you want to explore further?