

Nashville-Davidson County Continuum of Care

Grievance Policies & Procedures Manual



Submitted for Public Comment on 10/8/2025

Feedback and questions regarding this draft manual should be directed to following link:

<https://forms.office.com/g/zWLXx5UWe3>

All bolded/underlined words of this manual will be made into a hyperlink prior to the final approved release

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	3
	A. Background	3
	B. Purpose.....	4
	C. Definition and Guiding Principles.....	4
	D. Scope.....	5
	E. Anti-Retaliation Statement.....	5
II.	Grievance Form Process.....	6
III.	Grievance Policies and Procedures	7
	A. Collaborative Applicant	7
	B. Coordinated Entry Lead.....	8
	C. HMIS Lead	9
	D. CoC-Funded Agency	10
	E. Homelessness Planning Council / Member	11
	F. CoC Committee / Member	12
	G. CoC Funding Allocation	13
IV.	Alternative Resolution Options (as approved).....	13
	A. Third Party Mediation.....	13
	B. Grievance Review Panel	14
	C. Restorative Justice Practitioner/Coach	14
V.	Robert’s Rules of Order Cheat Sheet	15
VI.	Nashville-Davidson County CoC Grievance Form	17



I. INTRODUCTION


A. Background

The Continuum of Care (CoC) is a federal grant program created by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to promote community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness, increase access and utilization of homeless services, and distribute funding to support and quickly rehouse people experiencing homelessness. The mission of Nashville-Davidson County's CoC is to create a collaborative community-based process and approach to planning and managing effective homeless assistance resources and programs. The CoC is made up of an array of community partners working hand-in-hand to support a housing crisis resolution system that strives to effectively end homelessness for all people in Nashville and Davidson County. The Homelessness Planning Council (HPC) is the governing body of the Nashville-Davidson County CoC.

Differences and disagreements are natural to occur within such a large, important body of stakeholders within the CoC. However, outside of tenant rights, there is no required or advised grievance process from HUD regarding issues that may arise from within the CoC. Other regional CoC's across the state and nation have varying procedures regarding this, if they have one at all. Over the years, the Nashville-Davidson County CoC General Membership (GM) has raised this as a concern that should be addressed and an initial draft was attempted during the CoC's Governance Charter Committee's revision process in 2024. However, due to Nashville's unique CoC structure, the effort proved to be complicated and worthy of deeper focus and exploration before adding a new process to the Charter at the time. It was recommended by the Governance Charter committee to establish an Ad Hoc Task Force to draft Grievance Procedures to be added to the CoC Charter.



In April 2025, the HPC Chair approved the creation of an Ad Hoc Task Force - Initiatives Efficiency - which included the task to address grievance procedures for the CoC. The task force includes a diverse representation of people with lived experience, homeless serving agency staff, and community members committed to this important cause. The task force met regularly to hold robust discussion, gather and analyze research, utilize systems mapping tools to create a framework and drafted the first iteration of this manual. The goal is for this manual to be reviewed, modified and approved by the CoC GM, the HPC and subsequently part of a new revision of the CoC charter, to be considered in effect for Spring 2026.



B. Purpose

The Nashville-Davidson County Continuum of Care (CoC) is committed to providing a transparent process to address problems as they arise within the Continuum of Care. All service recipients and CoC members should feel comfortable that their complaints will be addressed promptly, fairly, and without fear of retaliation. Problems are best addressed as close to the source as possible, and the CoC encourages resolution of problems through internal processes. All CoC-funded agencies are expected to maintain internal grievance processes that ensure prompt and fair attention to issues as they arise, and that guard against retaliation. To the extent issues are not able to be resolved within individual agencies, the CoC has established this policy to guide how grievances may be brought to the CoC.

C. Grievance Definition and 5 Guiding Principles

Grievance is defined as a complaint, formal or informal, about a real or perceived wrong that causes resentment or a feeling of injustice.

We are guided by the following principles:

1. *Encourage resolution at the lowest possible level*
 - Emphasize direct, informal communication, and empower individuals to solve problems together before escalating issues up a formal chain of command. This strategy builds relationships, increases efficiency, and fosters a collaborative culture.
2. *Ensure non-retaliation against those who file grievances*
 - Establish clear non-retaliation policies, provide comprehensive anti-retaliation training and education, foster a "speak up" culture where concerns can be raised without fear of negative consequences, and implement strong response and monitoring systems.
3. *Maintain confidentiality and impartiality to the fullest extent possible*
 - Protect sensitive information using secure platforms, establish clear policies, assign neutral investigators, foster a culture of transparency and accountability, establish clear protocols to identify and address potential bias, and avoid conflicts of interest to ensure fairness and trust.
4. *Resolve grievances in a timely manner*
 - Establish a clear, well-communicated grievance policy with set deadlines for each stage. Initiate a formal process by having a written complaint, conduct a fair and thorough investigation with timely meetings and communication, and provide a clear decision and an appeal process.
5. *Ensure accessibility*
 - Make information understandable and usable for everyone by creating content in plain and preferred language, providing alternatives for visual and auditory media, using clear visual design with sufficient color contrast, and structuring content logically with headings and accessible forms.

D. Scope

This policy addresses:

- Individuals receiving services from CoC-funded programs.
- Staff and leadership of CoC-funded and member organizations
- CoC committees, subcommittees, and the Homelessness Planning Council.
- The Collaborative Applicant, Coordinated Entry Lead, and HMIS Lead.
- Decisions regarding CoC funding allocations, policy changes, and program implementation.

This policy **does not** directly address, but offers alternative considerations (Section IV) for concerns related to:

- Non-CoC funded programs.
- Non-CoC affiliated organizations.
- Criminal offenses and civil litigious matters, which should be filed and addressed by a court of law.
- Housing discrimination, which should be addressed directly with **HUD**.

E. Anti-Retaliation Statement



Anyone participating in the CoC has the right to file a grievance if they have a complaint regarding CoC matters. The Nashville-Davidson County CoC affirms that people who wish to file a grievance have the right to do so without retaliation from the party accused or any associated representative. Retaliation includes, but is not limited to; harassment, intimidation, violence, program dismissal, refusing to provide services, use of profane or derogatory language to or in reference to the complainant, or breach of contract. People with lived experience of homelessness engaging within the CoC are a particularly vulnerable group that should be protected from retaliation for candor, whistleblowing, or public critiques of governing bodies. In the event that retaliation is reported, the CoC Collaborative Applicant should work to investigate, intervene, and prevent future retaliation. Strategies for addressing retaliation may include, but are not limited to:

- Technical Assistance
- Safety Planning and Training
- Issuing a Notice or Findings based on requested supporting documentation.
- Issuing a Corrective Action Plan or Performance Improvement Plan
- Reallocating Continuum of Care funding

Any substantiated retaliation concerns and the strategy to alleviate grievance should be brought before the Homelessness Planning Council for final approval. If the CoC Collaborative Applicant or Homelessness Planning Council member/s are the subject of concern, the matter may be brought forth to the **Metro Board of Ethical Conduct or HUD**.

II. GRIEVANCE FORM PROCESS



A structured document has been created to formally record a complaint about an issue (See Grievance Form in Section VI of this manual) within the scope of the CoC. This serves as an optional first step in a formal grievance procedure in order to clearly document concerns, gather evidence and initiate a process for a fair and timely resolution to the matter. This form will be made available at all CoC-affiliated meetings as well as available to be submitted via online at [\(Link Coming Soon\)](#). The form will be submitted either in person or online to the Continuum of Care Manager, or another designated Collaborative Applicant role. This form is subject to the Tennessee Public Records Act should it be formally requested, with sensitive information withheld. This form may be completed anonymously, but it should be understood that it may mean that a reviewing party may be limited in their means to substantially facilitate the grievance process without knowing the affected party. The form should be completed by the aggrieved party themselves and should not be completed on someone else's behalf, except in circumstances where a reasonable accommodation is needed.

The form's information will be confidentially provided to the CoC's Executive Committee for review. This committee is made up of the officers (Chair/Vice Chair) of the CoC HPC and up to three additional HPC members appointed by the Chair of the HPC. The Executive Committee is responsible for setting the agenda for the HPC meetings, carrying out any specific tasks given to the committee and attend to any urgent business provided necessary within the HPC policies and strategic plans. Grievance procedures are an important process of the CoC of which the Executive Committee can fill a role in managing and monitoring the process for compliance.

The Executive Committee will be expected to review the grievance form provided by the designated Collaborative Applicant role within a week of their monthly scheduled Executive Committee meetings. The person who filed the grievance may attend this meeting in person to speak on their grievance during the meetings public comment period if they wish but it is not required in order for the matter to be addressed. Members may allow additional time outside of public comment period for grievance to be heard and reviewed. The Executive Committee will assign follow up procedures, which will include direction on the appropriate avenue to hear and process the grievance. The Executive Committee will not issue a final decision regarding the grievance but rather serve as a supportive liaison for the process to be properly implemented. Members of the Executive Committee who may have or appear to have a conflict with the grievance shall abstain from participation in the facilitation of this process.

Once a grievance form is submitted, the grievant should reasonably expect an update regarding their submission within 60 days. The grievant may also submit this form directly to the appropriate entity without Executive Committee review based upon the following directions provided within this manual. Repeat submissions for the same situation should be avoided once adjudicated through this process however this does not preclude filing grievances elsewhere.

III. GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

A. COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT



The **Collaborative Applicant (CA)** is the organization designated by the CoC to submit the CoC Registration and CoC Consolidated Application to HUD, and apply for CoC planning funds on behalf of the CoC, during the CoC Program Competition. In November 2023, the CoC General Membership designated the **Metro Office of Homeless Services** as CA Lead for a five-year period.

The Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) is a group that oversees the grant applications and ranking of grant proposals from CoC programs, which the CA consolidates and applies during funding competition periods. The PEC is designated as the body that reviews grievances towards the CA if the grievance is related to a matter within their role and responsibilities as collaborative applicant. For grievances related to client services from Metro Office of Homeless Services, those should follow the process noted under grievances toward a CoC-funded agency in Section III Part D of this manual. For grievances related to funding allocation and ranking decisions, reference Section III Part G of this manual.

Regardless if you are an individual of the public, a service recipient, CoC member, or CoC-funded provider, any and all grievances of the Collaborative Applicant should go through the same following process:

For COC-funded providers where the internal grievance process does not first resolve the matter, then it should be addressed to the **Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) via public comment** procedure made available for their committee meetings as scheduled on **OHS website**. It is advised, but not required, to utilize the **Grievance Form** available on OHS Website or in person at all committee meetings. The PEC may confer with the Collaborative Applicant, the Homelessness Planning Council and/or its Executive Committee to assist with resolving the matter. As a final measure, **HUD** is always an option to file a grievance with if matters cannot be resolved locally.

- **Note** that for all steps of the process, there are specific categories of grievances that can be addressed. Violations of **specific Continuum of Care policies or laws** can be submitted as a formal grievance with the Performance Evaluation Committee. Other circumstances may be reviewed at the Committee's discretion.

Please reference the following **link** for more information regarding grievance process towards the Collaborative Applicant.

B. COORDINATED ENTRY LEAD



Coordinated Entry (CE) is a shared community-wide intake process intended to match all people experiencing homelessness with certain available community resources that are best able to help them sustain safe and affordable housing. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires each Continuum of Care (CoC) to establish and operate a coordinated entry process.

The CE Lead manages CE operations and administrative functions, including staffing and managing budget and grant requirements. The **Coordinated Entry Oversight Committee** is responsible for recommending policy guidance for the Homelessness Planning Council and CE Lead on issues related to the implementation of the CE process. The current Coordinated Entry Lead is the **Metro Office of Homeless Services**. Any and all grievances of the CE Lead should go through the same following process, as outlined in Section IX of the **Coordinated Entry Manual**:


If there is a grievance in regard to the CE process as outlined in the CE Manual, then email **CEhelp@nashville.gov** with the names of those involved, the best contact information for them, and a description of the grievance. The CE Lead's CE Manager will respond to grievances within two to three business days. If the grievance concerns the CE Manager, it will be forwarded to their direct supervisor—the Assistant Director of Programs—for review and response.

If there is a grievance regarding particular providers accepting and making referrals through CE, then this should be first addressed and filed according to the provider's internal grievances procedures. (**Click here for current list of COC-funded providers and their grievance procedures**). Should the person not be satisfied with the appeal decision they have the right to appeal that decision to the board of the agency, and if not resolved to the participant's satisfaction, then appeal to the entity that awarded the funding.

For COC-funded providers where the internal grievance process does not first resolve the matter, then it should be addressed to the **CE Oversight Committee via public comment** procedure made available for their committee meetings as scheduled on **OHS website**. It is advised, but not required, to utilize the **Grievance Form** available on OHS Website or in person at all committee meetings. The CE Oversight Committee may confer with the relevant COC-funded agency, the Homelessness Planning Council and/or its Executive Committee to assist with resolving the matter. As a final measure, **HUD** is always an option to file a grievance with if matters cannot be resolved locally.

- **Note** that for all steps of the process, there are specific categories of grievances that can be addressed for the CE Lead. These include appeals of provider decisions if based on discrimination such as denial of services, denial of request to add a member of the household, or termination of services after acceptance into the program. Other circumstances may be reviewed at the Committee's discretion.

C. HMIS LEAD



The Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) is a local information technology system used to collect client-level data and data on the provision of housing and services to individuals and families experiencing or at-risk of homelessness. It is used as a tool to evaluate people's needs and assist them more effectively, avoiding duplication of services. The current designated HMIS Lead responsible for administering an effective community-wide HMIS was elected by the CoC General Membership to be the Metro Office of Homeless Services.

The Data and HMIS Oversight Committee promotes and ensures the collection of quality, comprehensive and relevant data about people experiencing homelessness in Nashville/Davidson County and the efforts of the CoC to address and end homelessness in this area. In addition to HMIS policy guidance, this Committee can be a body that reviews grievances towards the HMIS Lead if grievance is related to a matter within their role and responsibilities as the HMIS Lead.

Regardless if you are an individual of the public, a service recipient, CoC member, or CoC-funded provider, any and all grievances of the HMIS Lead should go through the same following process, as outlined in HMIS Policies and Procedures Manual - Grievance Policy 5.6:

Clients who suspect that an HMIS Participating Agency or end user has violated HMIS policies and procedures or other governing documents should follow the process described in the Corrective Action portion of Policy 3.2 within the HMIS Policies and Procedures Manual.

In cases where a client leaves one HMIS Participating Agency to receive services from another HMIS Participating Agency and reports a suspected violation by the first agency, the new HMIS Participating Agency may file a grievance on the client's behalf, as long as the client grants their permission to do so.

For COC-funded providers where the internal grievance process does not first resolve the matter, then it should be addressed to the Data and HMIS Oversight Committee via public comment procedure made available for their committee meetings as scheduled on OHS website. It is advised, but not required, to utilize the Grievance Form available on OHS Website or in person at all committee meetings. The Data and HMIS Oversight Committee may complete an investigation, conferring with the relevant COC-funded agency, the Homelessness Planning Council and/or its Executive Committee to assist with resolving the matter. As a final measure, HUD is always an option to file a grievance with if matters cannot be resolved locally.

- **Note** that for all steps of the process, there are specific categories of grievances that can be addressed. These include suspected violations of HMIS Policies and Procedures or laws governing the storage of, sharing of, and access to data in HMIS. Other circumstances may be reviewed at the Committee's discretion.

D. COC-FUNDED AGENCY



Each agency funded by the Continuum of Care is required to have their own grievance policy. The Collaborative Applicant (CA) maintains compliance with this policy and may be a source to reference if there is a grievance with the COC-funded agency that cannot be internally resolved.

Typically, agency grievances are brought upon by a service recipient to their immediate case worker, then up a chain of leadership to reach resolution. For a list of current CoC-Funded agencies/programs and their internal grievance policies, click [here](#).

Current Nashville/Davidson-County CoC-funded agencies as of 10/8/2025 are:

*Metropolitan Development & Housing
Agency*

Oasis Center

Office of Homeless Services

Park Center

Room in the Inn

Safe Haven Family Shelter

The Contributor

The Mary Parrish Center

The Salvation Army

Urban Housing Solutions

If the agency cannot reach resolution for the service recipient internally, then an issue can be brought forth to the Collaborative Applicant via the grievance form process, which will be addressed by the Assistant Director of Planning and Research or other designated CA role with responsibilities toward CoC-funded agencies. The matters may also be addressed by any of the alternative procedure methods advised in Section IV of this manual.

- **Note** that the Collaborative Applicant can only confer on CoC-funded agency grievances that violate policies such as code of conduct, HUD regulations and discrimination of a protected class.

Non-COC funded agencies or their COC member representatives cannot be required but are encouraged to adopt similar internal grievance policies, with this manual as a resource.

Non-COC members of the public should reasonably inquire with the specified agency representative to seek resolution of COC-funded agency grievances first before the option of bringing forth the issue to the Collaborative Applicant for support on a matter that could not be resolved internally for an agency they fund. The CA, via the Grievance Form submission process, may review the grievance with the agency or HUD at their discretion.

E. HOMELESSNESS PLANNING COUNCIL / MEMBER



The Continuum of Care's **Homelessness Planning Council (HPC)** is a 25-member governance board for Nashville-Davidson County's Continuum of Care, which coordinates the funding and delivery of housing and services to end homelessness in our community. The HPC is held to state and local laws for governing bodies as well as the CoC's Governance Charter and all applicable CoC policies, procedures, and bylaws.

Concerns from CoC members and the broader community towards HPC processes, decisions or meeting agenda items are best addressed transparently in the public comment period at HPC meetings. These meetings and the process for public comments can be found [here](#). It is the HPC's discretion on how they choose to address general procedural grievances brought forth, which may include further public deliberations, technical assistance consultation and/or drafting a formal public response regarding the matter at subsequent public meetings.

Grievances against the Homelessness Planning Council regarding a violation of specific Continuum of Care policies and/or applicable laws may also be addressed via public comment and/or be submitted via the CoC Grievance Form. For a reference of those policies and laws that may be considered, click [here](#). If not able to be immediately addressed during the public meeting, the matter may be further reviewed by the HPC's Executive Committee for direction on the appropriate avenue to hear and process the grievance. Members of the Executive Committee who may have or appear to have a conflict with the grievance shall abstain from participation in the facilitation of this process.

Due to the HPC being created as a government board/commission, ethical violations of a specified member/s of the Homelessness Planning Council may be submitted to the [Metro Board of Ethical Conduct](#). Ethical violations addressed by the Metro Board require a specified member be named, rather than the HPC as a whole. Any person may submit a complaint alleging that any one or more members have violated the standards of conduct or an executive order currently in effect, which regulates the ethical standards of conduct for employees of the metropolitan government. Standards of conduct that could be considered ethical violations may include conflict of interest, private financial gain, preferential treatment, and decision making outside of official and public channels. For more details on Metro Standards of Conduct and the executive order currently in effect listing potential violations, [click here](#).

Concerns about order or conduct of a member within a meeting can be addressed during meetings utilizing a Point of Order within guidelines of [Robert's Rules of Order](#). Concerns related to the conduct of the HPC presiding officer can be addressed as a "call the chair to order" or in the event of general membership discontent, a "no confidence" vote. For a quick reference guide to Robert's Rules of Order, [click here](#) or see Section V of this manual. Interpersonal concerns can also be addressed within the options of alternative procedures in Section IV of this manual.

F. COC COMMITTEE / MEMBER



Continuum of Care (CoC) Committees are responsible for working on strategic initiatives of the CoC and making relevant recommendations to the Homelessness Planning Council (HPC). Any individual of the public can attend the committees while official committee members are appointed by the HPC Chair on recommendations from the respective committee chair/s. The HPC Chair may also create an ad hoc task force for time limited and specified reasons that also support CoC needs as they come up. See the [following link](#) for more information regarding descriptions of current committees and the process for becoming a committee member.

Differences of opinion and hearing various perspectives are expected within committees' work. In Section IX – Part D of the CoC Governance Charter, a Code of Conduct is provided so that members understand the expectations regarding respectful deliberation during all CoC meetings at all times. This Code of Conduct is provided on all committee agenda's as follows:

All participants and attendees of public meetings, including the HPC, GM, and CoC committee meetings, are expected to abide by the following Code of Conduct:

1. Treat all participants with kindness and respect;
2. Value a variety of views and opinions;
3. Critique ideas, rather than individuals;
4. Refrain from demeaning or harassing behavior and speech;
5. Refrain from disruptive or disrespectful conduct;
6. Respect the process for meeting participation, including pre-registering to make a public comment; and
7. Disclose all potential conflicts of interest when first speaking, in alignment with Section IX Part E of the Charter.

Depending on the situation, the corrective or disciplinary action for issues may come from the Committee Chair, other Committee members or the Collaborative Applicant support staff. This may come in the form of direct and public notice of violation with opportunity to correct in real-time, as well as a separate communication detailing the violation concern with given opportunities to correct or mitigate. Repeated or egregious offenses, or dissatisfaction with the performance or direction of committees, may be brought forth via grievance form or public comment period to the HPC for facilitation in addressing the grievance matter.

With regard to interpersonal emotional harm, issues should be addressed internally between affected members and chairs, if necessary. Alternative procedures as outlined in Section IV of this manual may be an appropriate avenue to resolve grievances at this level. If a member is behaving inappropriately during meetings in a way that may be considered a violation of the Code of Conduct, it is advised to follow [Robert's Rules of Order](#) to maintain mutual respect amongst members of the committee. For a quick reference guide to Robert's Rules of Order, [click here or see Section V of this manual](#)

G. COC FUNDING ALLOCATION



The Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) is a group that oversees the grant applications and ranking of funding allocations from grant proposals of CoC programs, which the Collaborative Applicant consolidates and applies during funding competition periods. These rankings for consolidated applications are recommended to and approved by the Homelessness Planning Council. The PEC would also monitor voluntary or involuntary reallocation procedures, which could occur due to significant findings and underperformance – see [here](#) for more details on this reallocation policy.

For grievances related to funding allocation and ranking decisions, the PEC offers an appeals process. Only an applicant organization can participate in this appeals process. If an applicant organization objects to a decision made by the CoC Homelessness Planning Council regarding the ranking, rejection, or funding level of their project, or unsubstantiated by project performance, the applying agency may file an appeal to be considered by a three-member Appeals Committee within the time frame specified in HUD’s annual Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). The appeal must be based on one of the following:

- Agency did not receive information made available to other agencies;
- Allegation of bias, fraud, or misuse of federal funds on the part of the CoC Planning Council and/or the CoC Performance Evaluation Committee;
- Allegation that CoC Planning Council and/or the CoC Performance Evaluation Committee did not receive accurate information for proper scoring; and/or
- Violation of federal guidelines.

Please reference the following [link](#) for more information regarding grievance process with CoC Funding Allocation.

IV. ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES (AS APPROVED)



A. Third Party Mediation

Third-party Mediation is a flexible dispute resolution process in which an impartial third party helps disputing parties negotiate a mutually acceptable solution for a civil matter. Unlike an arbitrator, a mediator does not have the power to impose a decision but instead facilitates communication and guides the parties toward a collaborative, self-determined agreement. Mediation is not legally enforceable and comes with no guaranteed settlement however it does bring confidentiality, time-efficiency and creative solutions for situations that both parties wish to voluntarily reach resolution for. Mediation services often comes with a cost, that can be covered within the Collaborative Applicants funding, if desired. [Nashville Conflict Resolution Center](#), or agreed upon private mediation consultants, are options for this service.

B. Grievance Review Panel

A proposed alternative solution involves a small panel of neutral reviewers to facilitate the process and resolutions of the grievance. This would be a special called workgroup that is separate from any other current CoC committee tasked with hearing and mediating grievances brought within the CoC. These members may also serve as navigators or advocates for those unfamiliar with these formal processes and are seeking support outside of the Collaborative Applicant. To avoid conflicts of interest and model best practice, grievance review panels should include at least one lived experience leader who is unaffiliated with a potential agency in question, and a rotating community member trained in trauma-informed governance. This workgroup should include, but not limited to, people with skills in the fields of: lived experience of homelessness, mediation, human resources, conflict management, legal services, counseling, and advocacy work. The Nominating and Membership Committee may assist with recruiting and selecting voluntary representatives for this workgroup, of which the CoC GM will approve a final vote of its members. It is additionally advised for this panel to hold public-facing and confidentiality protected summaries of grievance outcomes, with optional public comment, to foster community trust and transparency. The CoC GM will further agree upon the roles and responsibilities of this panel, that will serve as its agreed resource for grievance proceedings henceforth.

C. Restorative Justice Practitioner/Coach

Restorative Justice is a new paradigm that seeks to reframe the way we conventionally think about wrongdoing and justice. This is done so by seeking resolution that affords healing, reparation and reintegration, and prevents future harm. Restorative justice is a principle-based approach that does not serve the purpose of minimizing the conflict and maximizing corporate interests, but rather it accepts the situation of conflict and extensively deals with the negative consequences for the people involved. Restorative justice philosophy expands beyond typical mediation formats by focusing on identifying needs and repairing harm, active accountability, and centering relationships and community. This can be an ideal solution for situations that don't have clear policy and are more of a personal transgression that is still worthy of repair and restoration in order to be a healthy functioning CoC body.

A restorative justice practitioner is a professional who leads structured, facilitated dialogues between those harmed and those responsible for harm, along with community members, to address the impact of an offense and find ways to repair it. They are trained in restorative principles to promote accountability, healing, and conflict resolution, working in community organizations and systems to foster empathy, understanding, and reintegration into the community. This can be in the form of or one to one coaching. Potential monitored by the Collaborative

circles or groups, conference trainings costs associated may be covered and Applicant, if desired.



V. Robert's Rules of Order Cheat Sheet

Robert's Rules of Order is a manual of parliamentary procedure to be used as a guide for conducting meetings and making decisions as a group. It is helpful to use Robert's Rules to bring order, fairness, and productivity to group meetings by providing a standardized framework for discussions and decision-making. Follow this condensed quick view of common procedures and how to handle them:

To:	You say:	Interrupt Speaker	Second Needed	Debatable	Amendable	Vote Needed
Introduce business	"I move that..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Amend a motion	"I move that this motion be amended by..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Postpone consideration	"I move that we postpone this matter until..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
End debate	"I move the previous question"	No	Yes	No	No	2/3
Alert urgent matters effecting participation	"Point of Privilege."	Yes	No	No	No	Chair Decides
Object to procedure or personal offense	"Point of order"	Yes	No	No	No	Chair Decides
Request of information	"Point of Information"	Yes	No	No	No	None needed
Confused about parliamentary rules	"Point of parliamentary inquiry"	Yes	No	No	No	None needed
Vote on a disagreed ruling by the chair	"I appeal the Chair's decision"	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Majority
Express serious concern and disapproval of a member's decision or behavior*	"I move for a vote of no confidence towards the Chair due to..."	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority

*Not a formal Robert's Rule of Order procedure but can be used as a motion for the body to document sentiments about serious concerns and encourage reconciliation.

Remember: 1. Listen to the other side 2. Focus on issues, not personalities 3. Avoid questioning motives 4. Be polite

PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING A MAIN MOTION

NOTE: Nothing goes to discussion without a motion being on the floor.

Obtaining and assigning the floor

A member raises hand when no one else has the floor

- The chair recognizes the member by name

How the Motion is Brought Before the Assembly

- The member makes the motion: *I move that (or "to") ...* and resumes their seat.
- Another member seconds the motion: *I second the motion* or *I second it* or *second*.
- The chair states the motion: *It is moved and seconded that...Are you ready for the question?*

Consideration of the Motion

1. Members can debate the motion.
2. Before speaking in debate, members obtain the floor.
3. The maker of the motion has first right to the floor if he claims it properly.
4. Debate must be confined to the merits of the motion.
5. Debate can be closed only by order of the assembly (2/3 vote), or by the chair if no one seeks the floor for further debate.

The chair puts the motion to a vote

1. The chair asks: *Are you ready for the question?* If no one rises to claim the floor, the chair proceeds to take the vote.
2. The chair says: *The question is on the adoption of the motion that ... As many as are in favor, say 'Aye'.* (Pause for response.) *Those opposed, say 'Nay'.* (Pause for response.) *Those abstained please say 'Aye'.*

The chair announces the result of the vote.

1. *The ayes have it, the motion carries, and ...* (indicating the effect of the vote) or
2. *The nays have it and the motion fails*

VI. Nashville-Davidson County Continuum of Care (CoC) Grievance Form

Your name: _____

Your contact information:

Details of grievance – Please be specific as to dates, times, locations, list of others involved, and policy/procedure/rule being challenged.
Steps taken to resolve the grievance, and what do you feel should be done to resolve this?

With my signature, I understand that this information may not remain confidential in order for the CoC to help resolve my grievance. I understand that this form will be reviewed by members of the CoC Executive Committee, the Homelessness Planning Council and the party I am grieving against, as applicable. I understand the CoC's commitment to anti-retaliation when sharing the above information.

Signature: _____

Date: _____