



<b>BOARD COMMITTEE DESCRIPTION</b>	<p>The Chicago Continuum of Care shall be governed by a Board of Directors (the Board), which will provide oversight and accountability for all Chicago CoC responsibilities.</p>
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p>Board Members: Amanda Pyron (The Network, At-Large); Amber Westbrook (Youth Action Board); Bennett Applegate (At-Large, Chair); Christine Haley (Cook County Health, At Large); Christy Prah (Chicago Funders Together to End Homelessness); Colleen Mahoney (DOH); Comm. Lisa Morrison Butler (DFSS); Dorothy Yancy (Lived Experience Commission), Fred Friedman (Lived Experience Commission); Ken Burnett (Service Providers Commission); Robert Cunningham (Lived Experience Commission); Michael Banghart (Service Providers Commission); Pete Toepfer (Service Providers Commission); Rev. Saeed Richardson (Faith Based) ; Rev. Sanja Stinson (Service Providers Commission); Richard Rowe (Lived Experience Commission); Sybil M. Madison (Mayor's Office); Todd Fuller (IDHS); Debbie Reznick (Private Funders); Regina Freeman-Hodges (Jesse Brown VA, At-Large); Steve Brown (UIC Health, At-Large); Carmelo Barbaro (Urban Labs, At-Large); Mary Howard (CHA);</p> <p>Alternates: Otha Gaston (Lived Experience Commission), Michele Gilbert (Service Provider); Richard Ducantenzieler (Service Provider)</p> <p>All Chicago Staff: Nicole Bahena, Beth Horwitz, Carolyn Ross, Steve Gaydos, Karisma Wilson, Cindy Brown, Keri Lowder, Erin Eagan</p> <p>Attendees: Andy Pires (Lincoln Park Community Services), Anna Lee (Chicago Community Trust), Chris O'Hara (Lived Experience Commission), Maura McCauley (DFSS), Tawanda Acosta (Christian Community Health Center); Arturo Bendixen; Cindy Blumenthal (Near West Side CDC); Alicia Brimage; Rebecca Darr (Wings); David Dempsey (Catholic Charities); Brian Esenberg (City of Chicago); Fiorito Fiorito (Wings); Lavon French (Christian Community Health Center); Christian Hall; Dana Kraus (Deborah's Place); Emily Krisciunas (Michael Reese Health Trust); Andrea Leflore; Emily Metz (Urban Labs); Patricia Montgomery; Emily Patterson (Trilogy Inc.); Brittany Ramenani (Trilogy Inc.); Sherri Reeves (Matthew House); Christine Riley (City of Chicago); Stephen Stapleton (Urban Labs) Jaye Stapleton (City of Chicago); Audrey Thomas (Deborah's Place); Aaron Neal; Joan Bundley</p>
<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Postponed the vote on the CoC Implementation Structure Lines of Action for 2021 until February 2021 Board Meeting.</b></li> <li>• <b>Approved the 2021 CoC Board of Directors and Executive Committee Slate.</b></li> <li>• <b>Directed All Chicago to select a new vendor for HMIS effective May 1, 2021, and for that vendor to be the vendor recommended by the ad hoc committee; the Board commits to raising funds necessary to ensure end users are appropriately trained.</b></li> </ul>

**Agenda Items**

AGENDA ITEM	Webinar Housekeeping Items and Welcome, Introductions/Roll Call
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	Nicole reviewed the webinar housekeeping items and conducted a roll call of CoC Board Members.

AGENDA ITEM	Consent Agenda
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Ben Applegate presented the Consent Agenda Items.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. December Meeting Agenda</li> <li>b. October Board Meeting Minutes</li> <li>c. Executive Committee Report</li> <li>d. Board Affairs Committee Report</li> <li>e. System Operations and Performance Committee Report</li> <li>f. All Chicago Report</li> </ol> <p>Fred requested that the All Chicago Report be pulled from the Consent Agenda. There was opposition to Fred’s request and the Consent Agenda was approved. It was agreed that Nicole will present the All Chicago Report after the main voting items.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	CoC Implementation Structure Lines of Action for 2021
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Nicole Bahena presented the Process and Opportunities and Input and discussed summary of public comments and concerns.</p> <p>Nicole and Beth Horwitz clarified what is an affinity group, what they do and how they are created, and discussion ensued.</p> <p>The 2021 Proposed Lines of Action up for vote are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System analysis and resource development</li> <li>• Homeless response system front door services</li> <li>• Expedited Housing Initiative</li> <li>• Racial equity</li> <li>• Connecting to Other Sectors: Employment and Income</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Butler voiced her concerns what the impact would be on DFSS. She stated she would like to have more time to discuss with All Chicago.</p> <p><b>Commissioner Butler motioned to postpone a vote on the CoC Implementation Structure Lines of Action to February 2021 Board Meeting, Fred seconded, one nay and motion passed.</b></p> <p>There was a discussion what kind of impact it would have by postponing the vote until February 2021.</p>

	<p>Debbie requested that Executive Committee or Chair of Board be involved with discussions with All Chicago and DFSS and discussion ensued. Commissioner Butler is not opposed to have others join conversation. Commissioner Butler will reach out once meeting is scheduled.</p> <p>Christy Haley requested a slide at the next meeting what is coming out of the Action Agenda and where they are going. Nicole has an outline and will share with the group.</p> <p>Richard Rowe requested to have a special meeting in January. All Chicago and DFSS will try and get their meeting schedule ASAP and possibly have special meeting in late January.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding how advocacy will be treated in the structure. Pete Toepfer discussed the SPC's and service providers community's thoughts on advocacy. Fred Friedman relayed the Board Affairs view on advocacy.</p>
--	--

AGENDA ITEM	2021 CoC Board of Directors and Executive Committee Slate
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Nicole presented the 2021 CoC Board of Directors and Executive Committee Slate.</p> <p><b>Motion brought by Board Affairs Committee to approve the 2021 CoC Board of Directors and Executive Committee Slate, there was no opposition.</b></p>

AGENDA ITEM	HMIS Vendor Change <a href="#">Update</a>
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Beth reviewed the vision for HMIS which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empower clients to share their information;</li> <li>• Ensure high quality, reliable data;</li> <li>• Facilitate easy, reliable access to data; and</li> <li>• Partner with other systems.</li> </ul> <p>She discussed the reasons for a vender change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier, reliable reporting software</li> <li>• Real time data reporting</li> <li>• Data integration with other systems (e.g., healthcare sector)</li> <li>• Built in data quality supports (e.g., auto-exit clients due to inactivity; individual field validation; data entry auditing)</li> <li>• Greater automation of coordinated entry matching</li> <li>• Easier management of shelter beds</li> <li>• Improved vendor support</li> </ul> <p>She discussed the process to date as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• August: ATAs were invited to participate in a vendor review process</li> <li>• September-November: vendors conducted demos and responded to specific community questions</li> </ul>

**Commented [NB1]:** @Beth Horwitz, please review this section re HMIS.

- December: three finalists were asked to respond to consistent questions and provide financial information

While there is coalescing around the vendor, the adhoc committee believes more time is needed to plan the rollout of the new software with the broader community and does not recommend a new vendor at this time.

All Chicago's typical contract with the current vendor rolls over at the end of April, so we would be looking at a migration in May of 2022.

The following concerns were addressed:

Carmelo had concerns regarding the delayed timeline for the planning for the change. The selection of the vendor seems different than the timing of the change. What are the concerns around the timing of the change, and does All Chicago agree with the committee's recommendation?

- Beth stated the current vendor's contract ends in April 2021 and renewal contract is one year and the vendor is unwilling to work with All Chicago to extend the contract for less than one year. It is either another 12 month contract or it ends on April 30. Some of the vendors indicated that a four month migration is longer than they typically take, but some members of the committee were concerned that it would be too fast for end users. Beth also shared that in the anticipated recommendation, there would have been questions about how to pay for the short-term financial gap to pay for the migration and would look to the Board's help to find the missing funding. The question about where the funds would come from also gave the committee reticence. Beth shared that on behalf of All Chicago, and for herself, vendor transitions are hard, that this would be a leap of faith on the new vendor, and this would have enormous impact for a number of people. For the first half of 2021, the HMIS staff of All Chicago will bear the brunt of that work, but the ATAs and end users will have to learn a new system, which should not be taken lightly. This will be a large amount of work for the system, but without changing vendors, there isn't a better future for Chicago until the change happens. For the duration of time we stay with Service Point, there will be pain points with data hard to pull out, data hard to enter, and difficulty generating reports. All of that pain will be with us while we remain with Service Point, and then still the pain of migration will be out there. For All Chicago, it feels like it will be very painful but we are excited about what could happen at the end of it. We think it is time to introduce the pain of transition with the hopes of a better future rather than live with the current pain for longer and then still face the pain of transition.

Carmelo restated and summarized Beth's comments that this would be delaying change but that not much will happen in the next year to make the pain of transition easier. Beth agreed with the assertion, but affirmed that having more time to make change could reduce peoples' concerns about making change. Beth also affirmed that while new vendors will not be perfect, we believe this will reduce many of the pain points in the community.

Carmelo also asked is there anything that can be done to make this shorter transition feasible and what the Board could do.

- Beth stated to fill the gap around cost so that it doesn't end up being the responsibility of individual agencies to pay those costs. All Chicago would hope not to charge individual agencies for this as it is a system cost. The Board's commitment to cover these costs would help. We could also ramp up what training looks like so that end users feel like they have every support they need. It would come with cost to engage the vendor on this, but this could also help in allaying concerns. Both would have financial implications and Beth did not know the dollar amount for training at the time of the meeting. Beth believed this would allay concerns but may not address all of their concerns.

Christine Haley stated that Beth talked about a four month time period being the time period that the vendors had done rollout. Is this comparable to a community of our size. And if you feel like you have current capacity to meet the need. Also, was it the bulk of the committee that said, that really felt like this was not appropriate, or is it a few outliers? And we've talked earlier about having something happening in January, you know, if there a special board meeting in January, if this was to be approved at that point, do you feel like that would meet the timeline for implementation?

- Beth shared that the vendor of interest is BitFocus with a software called Clarity. This is the company that communities, as they are leaving Service Point, are migrating to. They serve large communities, including LA, among others. All Chicago does have the capacity and has also been mindful of other support from consultants that would be needed for this type of effort and ensure we are migrating effectively. We will make sure this is the top priority. Beth was mindful that for every day we have to wait to have an approval and begin contracting process and process of roll out, we are in a balancing act—if we can do it in early January and have an approval, we could potentially migrate, but Beth was not sure what would change for the committee given April 30<sup>th</sup> approaching so didn't know what conversations could change to have a subsequent conversation in January with the Board.

Christine asked for clarification on whether this work could move forward at this time.

- Beth clarified that typically the process would entail that the working group would make a recommendation to the board and then the board would act. The working group does not have a recommendation at this time, but the Board could decide to do other things as the Board for the CoC. The things that would make it more palatable for the community or allay concerns would come around statements on how we would pay for this and the affirmation that the Board is committed to, with All Chicago, that the costs are covered and not put on individual agencies, and that the Board is affirming that added training support can be paid for. Sometimes system choices are made for the benefit of the system that are not in the interest of individual agencies but are important for the system overall. It is within the Board's purview to make that decision, though Beth did not think that the HMIS working group would come back to the Board with a different recommendation in early January. There are ways that the Board could make different decisions and address some of the concerns in the decision making.
- Carolyn shared that the current vendor is ending at the end of April. We asked for more time to make the transition, but the vendor is not willing to do that. The options at this point are to stay with the vendor, but much of the failures we've

had in trying to manage requests for data are a result of the vendor. We do not have a unanimous recommendation from the working group. If we do nothing, we will continue to not deliver at the level we need to with our data. End users are very important. But this would be kicking the can down the road.

Steve Brown shared his own experience with the current vendor and that it is a primitive system that does not reflect standards in software vendors and understands Beth's concerns to transition out of it. He also shared his experience managing software transitions and that four months sounds within the realm of possibility but maybe aggressive. He asked Beth if she believes that All Chicago has the resources to manage the transition if you were to get Board approval and do you think you could do it?

- Beth affirmed Steve's description of the system as a rudimentary one. All Chicago is ready for the transition and Chicago is a large CoC that would be a value add for the vendor as they think about their market share, and so they are motivated for this process to go well for us. Beth shared that the moment the migration was approved, we would contact the vendor for contracting and to determine the schedule and work with ATAs to understand data clean up activities, training and migration. We would also work with all the special groups to manage how their data would happen. The training for end users will happen at the end after the system customization. In January and February, the work would largely be on All Chicago and key partner, like the Coordinated Entry System, or the call center, to understand what it needs to entail so HMIS is structured in the right way. All Chicago would work with the vendor to get moving immediately.

Steve asked what would need to happen. Debbie shared that she understood that the Board could make a recommendation to move forward. Debbie stated she appreciates the conversation and thinks these are the decisions the Board should be making. She also stated that she appreciated All Chicago's perspective and knowledge of the community's needs. She understands that there's a \$160,000 gap over 18 months, and it doesn't sound like an unreasonable amount of money to be able to raise from private philanthropy, although private philanthropy is doing a lot to support the expedited Housing Initiative and the Flexible Housing. She is willing to help raise the money. Debbie asked whether we should be making a different decision because of COVID19.

- Beth shared that it was raised by at least one member of the committee. For other members, they felt that because of the way COVID has disrupted work, this would make it easier and address their pain points. Beth also shared that the committee is not fully representative of the perspectives in the community—it tends to be people who have figured out a way to make time to show up. Beth also shared that all of the trainings for Service Point have been able to migrate online and gone over smoothly. All Chicago believes they are ready to support the community through this. Beth also shared that this is one more thing end users need to learn, which is hard,

but also hope that the new system will reduce some of the data entry burden for some providers.

Fred asked for clarification on who is the broader community that needs to plan rollout.

- Beth clarified that it means the end users of the system who will need to interface with it to put in information. Beth does not anticipate there will be much implication for people experiencing homelessness about what data is entered, but rather, that it is the people who will put in the data. In phase two, we will work with other sectors about interfaces with HMIS.
- Beth stated that she was bringing information to the Board to empower them to make a decision. The committee that was convened does not recommend making a change at this time, which means we would make a transition in May 2022. Beth stated that she defers to the Board on whether they have a different recommendation or suggestion to make on how to move forward.

Carmelo asked whether the Board making a decision at a potential special meeting in January would put the transition at risk?

- Beth shared that every day waiting is a day more of losing time. If people wanted time to sit on this and come together in early January, it might be feasible, but much longer than early January, would be concerned about the time that would be sacrificed in the meantime. Beth also affirmed that there would likely be no new information in January to share.

Christine Haley stated this has been a topic of conversation for years. Shocked that May of 2022 is date for transition. Her feeling is May of 2022 is way too long to wait for intervention and change. Do you have capacity to roll out is doable? Concerned about continued delays. Christine also commented on the lack of input from the SPC.

Richard, having stepped in for Ben, asked if there was a motion to be made or if other conversation was needed.

**Carmelo made a motion that the Board direct All Chicago to select a new vendor for HMIS effective May 1, 2021, and for that vendor to be the vendor recommended by the ad hoc committee, and that the Board commits to raising \$175,000 funds necessary to ensure end users are appropriately trained, it was seconded by Christine Haley.**

Steve Brown asked if the vendor All Chicago recommended was the same as the one the committee would recommend.

- Beth stated she believed yes.

Debbie proposed adding the name of the vendor to the motion.

	The motion passed unanimously.
--	--------------------------------

AGENDA ITEM	Public Comment
<p><b>SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)</b></p>	<p>Chris O'Hara understood why the Board needed to make a decision, but believed that a special meeting in January would have made sense. He shared that the meeting occurred yesterday and that there had been no consensus on the vendor and there was no official tally. Chris believes public comment should occur much earlier in the Board meetings. Chris also raised concerns about how input was gathered from committee members about whether to make a vendor transition. He believed the process was very rushed. Doesn't understand why decision had to be made today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beth stated financial pieces will be covered by the Board. Beth also stated that the question of who was in the working group raises an interesting question about how the community makes decisions generally to ensure that there is collective input in discussions. Agencies have ATAs and would look to them to share information in their agency, though Beth acknowledged this does not always occur. Beth also stated that All Chicago came forward today with information and acknowledgement that the committee did not have a recommendation, but the Board made a different decision that we could not wait to make the migration. All Chicago will work with the committee to determine how this moves forward and maximize the time we have for the roll out.</li> </ul> <p>Debbie appreciated Chris' comments and his frustration on not being able to speak earlier. She also stated that Beth did not advocate with the board for a vote. Carmelo asked a question that prompted a discussion among the Board and a decision. Beth was very clear that this was not something the committee wanted. All Chicago will need to work with the committee to roll this out. If people are going to be upset, they should be upset with the Board. To the Service Providers in the room, this is the Board's decision, made on our own questions. Debbie asked Beth to send her the language used about the reasons for the vendor switch and she would be happy to help with advocating for funding to cover the costs.</p> <p>Carmelo – echoed what Debbie said and appreciates Chris' comments. Ideally this process would have looked different and would have taken more time, but stands by motion he made and took Beth at her word that waiting could put the transition at risk. Carmelo also trusts Beth's comments on the support for the vendor, but would support special meeting in January if needed if new information comes to light.</p> <p>Debbie also affirmed that there was unanimous Board support for the motion around HMIS.</p> <p><b>Richard Rowe moved to extend meeting 5 or 10 minutes, no opposition.</b></p> <p>Christy Prah – The vendor used for HMIS does not feel like a governance decision the Board should be making. The vendor selection should be within the confines of the work product of All Chicago within their role, in consultation with providers. Christy raised the</p>

	<p>question of whether the Board should decide which vendor or rather, if the Board should trust All Chicago to determine which vendor.</p> <p>Richard what can we do right now to allow All Chicago to make the decision about the vendor.</p> <p>Carolyn stated that All Chicago will work with the committee to determine the vendor. All Chicago is here to do the work jointly and appreciates what the Board did today.</p> <p><b>Debbie moved to amend the motion to remove the vendor and specific dollar amount to be raised, there was no objections, motion passed.</b></p>
--	--

AGENDA ITEM	All Chicago Report
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Nicole gave an update on HUD 2020 NOFA. It is unknown if a NOFA process will occur, but All Chicago has developed a <a href="#">contingency plan</a>. Nicole will follow up with Members if a decision is made regarding the NOFA.</p> <p>All Chicago is currently preparing for the annual Housing Inventory Count (HIC) scheduled to occur on Tuesday, January 26, 2021. The Pre-HIC will open on December 23, 2020 and Providers can confirm information about their projects at their convenience until the process closes. The HIC will open on January 26, 2021. Agencies will provide occupancy information on projects on the night of January 26</p> <p>Nicole discussed the 2021 Point-in-Time Count Methodology. She encouraged members to review the materials in the packet.</p> <p>Bonus funding</p>

AGENDA ITEM	Year End Wrap UP
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Carolyn thanked everyone for the dedication and work.</p> <p>She thanked Ben Applegate for his service and welcomed Richard Rowe as the next Chair.</p> <p>Richard commended Carolyn and All Chicago for their hard work.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	Adjournment
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES (MOTIONS, DECISIONS)	<p>Richard reminded the Board that there is an All CoC Board Meeting on Friday, December 18.</p> <p>Meeting Adjourned</p>