



MEETING LINKS

Meeting Packet: <https://tinyurl.com/5cpzx2sa>

Discussion Guide:

Hybrid Governance Model Overview: <https://tinyurl.com/a6cjrksj>

Hybrid Voting Model Overview: <https://tinyurl.com/y9a2s4zz>

OVERVIEW

Thank you all for taking the time to engage with this process so thoughtfully. Today's session is not about rushing to decisions but about pausing to reflect on where we are, where we feel aligned, and where we can refine further. Your responses to the survey show a strong investment in this work, and I want to honor that by creating space for exploration rather than pressure to finalize.

Let's use this time to collectively build on the foundation we've laid and allow the next steps to emerge naturally. Progress is not always about action—it's about alignment, and today, we focus on aligning with the collective vision we're creating together.

Governance Model Feedback

The **governance model discussion** reflected strong support for the Hybrid Model, which combines elements of collaborative decision-making and organizational structure. Respondents emphasized the need for well-defined roles and responsibilities to ensure efficiency and equity. Some members highlighted the importance of structured leadership transitions, suggesting a time-limited approach with overlapping terms for continuity. This reflects a broader desire for thoughtful, transparent governance processes that empower members to engage meaningfully while ensuring long-term stability.

Hybrid Governance Model Overview: <https://tinyurl.com/a6cjrksj>

Recommendation:

- Adopt the Hybrid Model with refinements to address leadership transitions.
- Develop guidelines for time-limited lead roles with structured overlap (e.g., Lead #1 serves two years, Lead #2 transitions as Assistant Lead in year two).
- Formalize governance policies to define roles, quorum requirements, and decision-making thresholds.

Governance: Hybrid Governance Model Overview: <https://tinyurl.com/a6cjrksj>

“What refinements or adjustments would make the hybrid model most effective for this group?”

Role Clarity:

- Define time-limited leadership roles to ensure rotation and fresh perspectives.
- Clarify responsibilities for decision-making versus advisory input to prevent overlap or ambiguity.

Inclusivity: Incorporate mechanisms for smaller organizations to have meaningful input, such as subcommittees or advisory panels.

Efficiency:

- Develop clear procedures for decision-making, ensuring timely resolutions while maintaining inclusivity.
- Propose streamlined communication channels to keep discussions focused.

Alignment with Values: Emphasize the hybrid model’s balance between collaboration and practicality, aligning with the group’s shared vision.

Chair and Vice-Chair Role Exploration

Rotating Role or Elected Annually: Provide a brief guide or pre-meeting check-in for the Chair to understand what's expected in advance of meetings

Responsibilities:

Meeting Facilitation:

- Preside over meetings to ensure discussions are orderly, focused, and productive.
- Act as a neutral party to guide discussions and encourage balanced participation.

Governance Oversight:

- Represent the consortium in governance-related discussions, particularly those requiring member perspectives (e.g., during formal decision-making or alignment efforts with other bodies like BHAC).

Member Advocacy:

- Serve as the voice of the membership when member-specific issues arise, ensuring diverse perspectives are represented in governance decisions.

Supporting Decisions:

- Help synthesize key points from discussions to guide voting or consensus-building during meetings.

Responsibilities Not Included:

- Administrative work (agenda preparation, meeting notes, follow-ups)—these will remain your responsibility as Director.
- External representation for operational matters, unless explicitly required in a governance capacity.

Time Commitment:

- Chair responsibilities are limited to meeting facilitation and governance-related discussions.
- Estimated time: 1-2 hours per month.

Voting Model Feedback

On **voting models**, the Hybrid approach was again the preferred choice. Members appreciated its balance of inclusivity and practicality but raised questions about implementation, particularly how voting weight might be distributed and how decisions could accommodate diverse organizational interests. Some members also expressed concerns about the process for adding or removing voting members and the potential challenges of maintaining accountability in a dynamic consortium. These comments underscore a need for clearer examples of how voting would function in real-world scenarios to build confidence in the proposed systems.

Recommendation:

- Move forward with the Hybrid Voting Model while addressing concerns about representation and fairness.
- Create examples of decision-making scenarios in the Hybrid and Collaborative models to demonstrate practical implementation.
- Develop clear policies for adding and removing voting members and consider vote-by-proxy options for flexibility.

Voting Model Discussion - How do we ensure clarity and fairness in our chosen voting model?

Transparent Criteria:

- Clearly outline the criteria for voting eligibility and weight (e.g., organizational size, sector representation).

Weighted Voting Adjustments:

- Offer a hybrid approach where votes are weighted based on organization size but capped to ensure smaller groups remain influential.

Fallback Options:

- Establish a procedure where consensus-based decision-making transitions to a majority vote when disagreements arise.

Education and Simulation:

- Propose a trial run of the voting model using sample decisions to test clarity and fairness.

Voting Scenarios

Scenario 1: Weighted Voting Among Larger vs. Smaller Organizations

- **Decision:** Allocating funding for a new initiative.
- **Details:** Larger organizations advocate for proportionate funding based on service capacity, while smaller groups request an equal share to ensure sustainability.
- **Discussion Prompt:**
“How might we structure a weighted vote to balance proportionality and equity?”

Scenario 2: Consensus-Based Voting with Fallback

- **Decision:** Establishing a new community outreach program.
- **Details:** The group initially seeks consensus but faces disagreement on program priorities. A fallback vote requires a majority to move forward.
- **Discussion Prompt:**
“What criteria should determine when consensus is no longer feasible, and fallback voting is necessary?”

Scenario 3: Sector-Based Voting Challenge

- **Decision:** Prioritizing community health goals.
- **Details:** Representatives from healthcare, education, and law enforcement sectors advocate for different primary goals. Each sector votes, but results are not aligned.
- **Discussion Prompt:**
“How can we ensure sector-based voting effectively reflects diverse priorities without creating gridlock?”

Member Roles Feedback

The feedback on **member roles** revealed varying levels of understanding and engagement with the descriptions provided. Of the 18 members, **15 have completed their Member Role reviews, 2 are in the process of finalizing edits, and 1 has not yet responded.** While many members found the descriptions helpful, others noted a need for greater specificity, as well as a desire to have their Board review the role description. Members generally agreed that role descriptions should remain flexible and collaborative, evolving to reflect the Consortium's needs and member expertise.

Recommendation:

- Encourage remaining members to use the existing role descriptions as starting points, rather than prescriptive drafts, for developing specific responsibilities.
- Schedule follow-up discussions to clarify roles for organizations with unique or complex functions, such as Crisis Response.
- Establish role refinement as an ongoing process, updating descriptions as the Consortium's needs evolve, and adding a section on data as the Consortium gains clarity on the collaborative and/or collective metrics to be tracked.

Member Role Discussion: Are there additional ways to clarify and align member roles?

Detailed Descriptions:

- Provide examples of specific responsibilities for each role to avoid ambiguity.

Collaboration Opportunities:

- Include structured opportunities for members to contribute collaboratively outside formal meetings, such as working groups.

Accountability Mechanisms:

- Outline expectations for data collection/reporting and follow-up on assigned tasks, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Role Adjustments:

- Allow flexibility for smaller organizations to scale their involvement based on capacity while ensuring their voices are heard.

BHAC-BHC MOU Feedback

In discussions about the **BHAC-BHC MOU**, members acknowledged the potential benefits of stronger collaboration between the two groups. However, concerns were raised about transparency and vulnerability. One respondent expressed unease about the BHAC gaining access to the “messiness” of internal Consortium operations, particularly as the BHC continues to refine its systems and processes. This comment highlights a tension between the desire for collaboration and the need for the Consortium to project cohesion and competence in external relationships. Members also suggested that regular reporting between the BHAC and BHC should be bidirectional to ensure accountability and alignment without compromising internal dynamics.

Recommendation:

- Address transparency concerns by formalizing cross-reporting protocols between BHAC and BHC.
 - Create reporting templates that outline the scope of shared information, ensuring consistency while safeguarding internal operations.
 - Continue refining the MOU with member input to strike a balance between collaboration and strategic discretion.
-

Feedback Discussion: "How can we establish boundaries and processes for cross-representation that ensure effective collaboration without exposing the BHC's internal refinements prematurely?"

Define Levels of Transparency

- **Strategic Reporting:** Representatives should share high-level updates with the BHAC, focusing on finalized decisions, overarching goals, and collaborative opportunities, rather than unfinished or evolving processes.
- **Confidential Space:** Clearly define certain areas of BHC discussions (e.g., sensitive funding strategies, early-stage policy drafts) as internal to ensure members feel secure in refining processes without external pressure.

Tailor Messaging

- Develop **key messages** for representatives to use when discussing BHC updates, ensuring consistency and alignment with the Consortium's public-facing priorities.
- Representatives should frame updates to highlight the BHC's strengths and focus on progress rather than challenges or unresolved issues.

Structured Feedback Loops

- Representatives can collect input from BHAC on specific issues without sharing granular internal details, ensuring collaboration remains constructive and respectful of BHC's refinement process.
- Incorporate feedback as actionable insights that BHC can adapt without losing autonomy.

Governance Policies

- Incorporate specific language into governance policies outlining the **scope of information sharing**:
 - "BHC representatives to BHAC are responsible for providing high-level updates that reflect finalized actions and strategic goals, avoiding disclosure of sensitive or incomplete internal processes."
 - Include an accountability measure for representatives to maintain these boundaries.

Build Confidence Through Intentional Communication

- **Internal Messaging:** Reassure BHC members that cross-representation is designed to strengthen alignment, not to critique or interfere with their internal processes.
 - **External Messaging:** Position the BHC as a collaborative, forward-thinking entity while acknowledging the ongoing nature of systems development as part of its growth journey.
-

How this Addresses Unease with Cross-Representation

- **Balance Transparency and Privacy:** By defining clear boundaries on what representatives share, members can feel confident their internal discussions remain protected.
- **Empower Representatives:** Equip them with tools (e.g., messaging templates, clear policies) to navigate sensitive topics effectively.
- **Focus on Strengths:** Highlight achievements and progress in external discussions, framing internal refinement as a natural and positive part of organizational growth.

Cross-Representation Between BHC and BHAC

One **significant suggestion** was the need for greater direction and structure regarding representation at the BHC and BHAC. Members raised questions about how BHC representatives to the BHAC are selected, how they can effectively collect and disseminate information to the broader BHC membership, and how their responsibilities should be articulated to ensure consistency and accountability. A draft role description was recommended for BHC representatives to the BHAC, with the same requested of the BHAC for their representative to the BHC. This feedback highlights the importance of formalizing processes for cross-representation to ensure alignment and transparency between the two groups.

Recommendation:

- Draft and formalize role descriptions for BHC representatives to the BHAC and vice versa.
 - Specify processes for collecting and disseminating information between the two groups, including expectations for regular reporting.
 - Include these role descriptions as part of the governance policies to ensure consistency and accountability.
-

Cross-Representation Between BHC-BHAC Discussion: What specific processes and expectations should we establish to ensure cross-representation between BHC and BHAC is consistent, transparent, and effective in aligning priorities and actions?"

Role / Core Responsibilities Elements to Consideration for BHC Representatives to BHAC and BHAC Representatives to BHC

Information Sharing:

- BHC to BHAC:
 - Provide high-level updates on finalized actions, strategic goals, and initiatives from the BHC.
 - Share key achievements and collaborative opportunities without disclosing sensitive or incomplete internal processes.
 - BHAC to BHC:
 - Report on BHAC priorities, decisions, and actions relevant to BHC's objectives and collaborative efforts.
 - Highlight alignment opportunities and mutual goals.
-

Role Element Considerations for BHC Representatives to BHAC and BHAC Representatives to BHC – Cont'd

- Two-Way Feedback Loop:
 - Gather relevant input and perspectives from their respective group to inform discussions at the other table.
 - Facilitate the flow of actionable feedback between groups while respecting defined boundaries for information sharing.

Communication and Reporting Processes

Pre-Meeting Preparation:

- Review agendas in advance and consult with their group to identify priorities, questions, or feedback to bring forward.

Regular Reporting:

- Use a standardized reporting template to ensure updates are consistent, clear, and focused on actionable insights.
- Emphasize progress, alignment opportunities, and high-level decisions in reports.

Post-Meeting Follow-Up:

- Debrief their respective group after meetings, summarizing key outcomes and gathering input for future discussions.

Confidentiality and Boundaries:

- Adhere to governance policies defining the scope of information sharing to maintain trust and protect sensitive internal discussions.

Selection and Term Lengths

Selection Criteria:

- Representatives should possess:
 - A clear understanding of their group's mission, objectives, and governance processes.
 - Strong communication, facilitation, and collaboration skills.
 - A demonstrated ability to balance transparency with confidentiality.

Term Lengths:

- Fixed terms (e.g., one year) to provide continuity while allowing for rotation to incorporate diverse perspectives.

Nomination Process:

- Representatives should be nominated and selected through a transparent and equitable process.

Accountability and Governance

Role Expectations:

- Attend meetings regularly, actively participate in discussions, and represent their group's interests while respecting defined boundaries.
- Provide timely and accurate updates and reports to their group.

Accountability Measures:

- Include role descriptions in governance policies for formal accountability.
- Establish a process for evaluating representatives' effectiveness, including feedback from group members.
- Define a protocol for addressing lapses in representation or reporting.

Training and Support

Orientation and Resources:

- Provide representatives with an orientation on their role, responsibilities, and boundaries for information sharing.
- Offer written guides or FAQs to ensure clarity and consistency in their role.

Staff or Coordinator Support:

- Assign staff or a coordinator to assist with reporting, document preparation, and follow-up tasks.

Boundary Training:

- Include specific training on navigating sensitive topics and maintaining the balance between transparency and confidentiality.

How This Addresses Concerns

- **Manages Unease About Transparency:** By defining clear boundaries, representatives can share relevant updates without exposing the “messiness” of internal processes.
- **Balances Collaboration and Privacy:** Strategic reporting focuses on progress and alignment while keeping sensitive discussions internal.



- **Formalizes Expectations:** Governance policies and training provide a consistent framework for representatives to follow, ensuring trust and accountability.
- **Provides Support:** Staff and coordinator assistance reduce the burden on representatives, ensuring roles are manageable.

Metrics Development Feedback

Feedback on **metrics development** pointed to a strong interest in tracking outcomes such as access to services, crisis response, and coordination efforts. However, members also identified challenges, including inconsistent data collection practices across organizations and the risk of duplicating efforts. Respondents emphasized the importance of integrating qualitative data and community input to complement quantitative metrics, ensuring a holistic approach to measuring success. These insights reinforce the need for a shared framework that balances rigor with flexibility, supporting both operational goals and community impact.

Recommendation:

- Continue the exploration of the priority metrics after the New Year.
 - Set goal and plan to develop a shared framework for data collection that includes standardized definitions and avoids duplication.
 - Include qualitative measures and community feedback to provide a comprehensive view of impact.
-

Metrics Discussion: What steps can we take to develop a shared metrics framework that ensures consistency, avoids duplication, and incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data to measure success effectively?

Identify Priority Metrics

Start with the Identified Priority Areas

Refine These Metrics:

- Collaborate with members to define these metrics clearly.
 - Ensure metrics align with the goals of the consortium and reflect community needs.
-

Standardize Definitions and Data Collection

Develop a Shared Glossary:

- Agree on standardized definitions for each metric (e.g., what constitutes “access to services” or a “successful crisis response”).

Align Data Collection Practices:

- Work with member organizations to identify existing data collection methods.
 - Integrate best practices and address inconsistencies to create a cohesive approach.
-

Centralize Data Sharing:

- Consider a shared platform or template for consistent reporting across organizations.
-

Incorporate Qualitative Data

Collect Community Feedback:

- Use surveys, focus groups, or interviews to capture the lived experiences of service users and community members.
- Ensure feedback represents diverse populations and needs.

Measure Narrative Impact:

- Track stories and testimonials to complement quantitative data and highlight the human impact of consortium efforts.
-

Avoid Duplication

Map Existing Efforts:

- Identify metrics currently being tracked by member organizations.
- Cross-reference to eliminate redundancy and ensure alignment with broader goals.

Coordinate with Other Entities:

- Engage with BHAC and other stakeholders to ensure metrics align with regional or state-level reporting requirements.
-

Build Flexibility Into the Framework

Phased Implementation:

- Introduce priority metrics first, allowing time to refine and expand the framework based on feedback and results.

Adapt to Changing Needs:

- Ensure the framework can evolve as priorities shift or new challenges emerge.
-

Create Accountability and Support

Assign Roles: Designate individuals or teams to lead metrics development and coordination.

Provide Training: Offer workshops or resources to help member organizations align with the shared framework.

Regular Review: Schedule periodic reviews of the framework to assess effectiveness and make necessary adjustments.

How This Addresses Feedback

- **Consistent Definitions and Practices:** Standardized approaches address inconsistencies in data collection and provide a reliable basis for analysis.
 - **Avoids Duplication:** Mapping current efforts ensures efficiency and prevents wasted resources.
 - **Holistic Measurement:** Incorporating qualitative data and community feedback captures the full scope of impact.
 - **Supports Operational and Community Goals:** Balances rigor with flexibility to meet both organizational and community needs.
-

Next Steps for Discussion

- What are the immediate priorities for metrics development in 2025?
- Are there existing tools or platforms we could use to centralize data collection and reporting?
- How can we effectively engage the community to provide qualitative insights?

General Feedback

Throughout the survey, members generally appreciated the opportunity to provide input, particularly on complex issues requiring thoughtful deliberation. The surveys are designed to streamline conversations and ensure that all members—whether present or not—can contribute their perspectives. One member raised concerns about the alignment between surveys and meeting discussions, suggesting there may be overlapping content. This feedback underscores the importance of using surveys as a complementary tool to meetings, ensuring that each serves a distinct purpose in the decision-making process.

Recommendation:

- Reaffirm the role of surveys in streamlining discussions by capturing input from members as their perspective evolves from one meeting to the next on complex topics, and those who may be unable to attend meetings where these topics have been discussed.
- Encourage members to share suggestions for improving the process to enhance engagement and avoid redundancy.

Welcome and Opening Context (3:00 – 3:05 PM)

- Meeting goals: Collaborative discussion of survey feedback and alignment on next steps.

Survey Feedback Highlights (3:05 – 3:15 PM)

Key insights from the survey:

- Governance Model: Strong preference for the Hybrid Model; recommendations for leadership transitions and formal policies.
- Voting Model: Hybrid Voting Model preferred; need for clarity through examples.
- Member Roles: Progress update on role reviews; ongoing refinements.
- Cross-Representation and MOU: Recommendations for role descriptions and reporting protocols.
- Metrics Development: Identified priorities; work to resume in 2025.

Governance and Voting Models Discussion (3:15 – 3:30 PM)

- Governance Model: Refinements for leadership transitions and policy clarity.
- Voting Model: Practical examples for decision-making scenarios.
- Open discussion for additional feedback.

Member Roles and BHAC-BHC Relationship (3:30 – 3:45 PM)

- Member Roles: Progress update and discussion on ongoing refinements.
- Cross-Representation and MOU:
 - Role descriptions for representatives between BHC and BHAC.
 - Balancing transparency and collaboration.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps (3:45 – 4:00 PM)

- Recap of key takeaways.
- Next steps:
 - Refine governance, voting, and role descriptions.
 - Begin MOU development and revisit metrics in the new year.
- Next BHC meeting: February 13, 2025