

**Community Planning Group
CPG Nominations Committee**

Meeting Minutes of

Friday, March 4, 2011

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107

Present: Terri Clark, Chris Collins, Tony Daniel, Annet Davis-Vogel, Lawrence Frazier

Absent: Andrea Johnson

Staff: Debbie Law, Briana Morgan, Nishika Vidanage

Call to Order/Introductions:

T. Clark called the meeting to order at 11:29 a.m.

Approval of Agenda:

T. Clark presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** A. Davis-Vogel moved, L. Frazier seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes (26 August 2010):

Tabled.

Report of Co-Chairs:

Tabled.

Report of Staff:

None.

Discussion Items:

• **Membership Application Review Process**

D. Law reviewed the open nominations process (*see – attached handout*). T. Clark clarified that she would not be participating on the Nominations Committee going forward.

D. Law stated that they had modified the open nominations process in the previous year, and continued to review the process. She explained that members of the Nominations Committee were supposed to participate in other committees in addition to that committee since they only met six months out of the year. She went on to say that applications were scored blinded to ensure a fair process, and that they also needed to meet certain representation areas and demographics. She also noted that they try to match the epidemic as closely as they possibly can. She went on to say that they currently had 31 members, and that the CPG could have anywhere from twenty to thirty-five members. She added that they had three membership gaps to fill, including “governmental education agency,” “epidemiology,” and “mothers with or at risk for HIV infection.” L. Frazier stated that CPG currently had no Trans members, but that

this was not identified as a gap. D. Law replied that they did not have data on the epidemic among Trans people, so this group was not captured as a needed demographic. She then explained that Trans could be considered a risk category. A. Davis-Vogel replied that that was not right, and that it would not be appropriate to include someone that is Trans as a risk category rather than a gender. T. Clark stated that, while Trans was not an identified gap, the committee was aware of the issue.

D. Law then stated that there was a score card to be completed for each applicant. She explained that they would need to review the applicant's understanding of the CPG, skills/experiences, representation needed, and clarity of contribution. T. Clark asked how they would be able to accurately score an application without a cover letter or resume. T. Daniel replied that he thought it would make sense for an applicant to submit a cover letter, resume, or references. He explained that it was very difficult to score applications with limited information, and they had a hard time making choices. He went on to say that they could see current problems in CPG membership that were probably related to this problem. He then noted that they would be able to change the application going forward to include more information. C. Collins added that the application had previously been longer. A. Davis-Vogel agreed that there used to be more open-ended questions on the application. C. Collins explained that the committee had found the original application to be too long, and that they had decided to shorten it to two pages. He went on to say that they were able to ask Office staff whether an applicant had attended meetings before. He then stated that they could make it mandatory to add a resume, or a paragraph on why the applicant would like to join the CPG. T. Daniel stated that they should support the request for additional information, because this information could help the co-chairs to find future members for their committees. C. Collins agreed with this, but went on to say that they did not want the CPG to be so provider-heavy as to dissuade community members from applying for the CPG. He explained that the community members might be less likely to provide a resume. T. Daniel replied that he did not think that community members would have a problem with providing a resume. A. Davis-Vogel stated that it may be too much to ask for a resume, but that it would be important to request a paragraph on why an applicant would like to join the CPG. T. Clark agreed with this.

D. Law then stated that the CPG had three members with terms expiring, and that two of these members had reapplied. She needed that D. Acosta, governmental co-chair of the CPG, had not yet submitted his application, so they would need to make a decision contingent on receipt of his application.

The group then broke to score applications. While D. Law tabulated scores, A. Davis-Vogel stated that they should have a question included in the application on the applicant's understanding of the CPG. The group agreed, and expressed confusion over how to score this. T. Clark stated noted that there were a lot of members that did not attend the meetings.

Upon D. Law's return, she noted that there were only four scores for #105, since this person had not submitted an actual application. T. Daniel noted that he had abstained from scoring since he did not have an application present.

T. Clark stated that #105 and #104 would be approved due to their scores. The group then reviewed #103. T. Clark stated that they should approve all of these applicants for membership. She explained that, if the members were willing to work on the committees, then they would be welcome on the CPG. **Motion:** T. Clark moved, A. Davis-Vogel seconded to approve all of the applicants. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

T. Daniel next stated that they could review attendance in a better way, and suggested having attendance information provided earlier. A. Davis-Vogel suggested sending a letter to anyone that had not attended CPG meetings (aside from those with medical leave) that stated that they would be removed from the CPG if they did not attend the next meeting. C. Collins stated that they currently had five members with four consecutive unexcused absences, and suggested removing them. A. Davis-Vogel agreed with this. **Motion:** A. Davis-Vogel moved, C. Collins seconded to remove J. Anderson, J. Bennett, W. Briscoe, J. Hairston, and A. Johnson from the CPG due to attendance policy violations. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

L. Frazier asked for more information about N. Deroose's attendance record. D. Law replied that he was on a leave of absence. T. Daniel added that N. Deroose had recently returned from abroad, and volunteered to contact him. C. Collins then asked about L. Espinosa's attendance. B. Morgan replied that her agency had experienced some staff vacancies, and that she had recently emailed OHP staff to let them know that she planned to get more involved. The group agreed then that D. Acero had been committed to the process, and had experienced some health issues. The group then reviewed T. King's attendance. They noted that he had attended one of the past four CPG meetings, and that he had not been attending Literature & Education Committee meetings. T. Daniel volunteered to contact this member. D. Law noted that T. King tended to call OHP staff to ask about the CPG, and added that there had been a great deal of changes at his agency. A. Davis-Vogel suggested keeping T. King as a member until they were able to contact him to see if he is still interested in participating. A. Davis-Vogel then asked about R. Waite's attendance record, and D. Law replied that she had resigned.

The group next reviewed the subcommittee attendance chart. A. Davis-Vogel stated that her name should be added to the list of Planning Priorities Committee members, since she had been working directly with M. Castillo. The group agreed to add A. Davis-Vogel to the committee and the email list.

L. Frazier stated that he had difficulty getting out of the office for short periods of time, which was why he had not joined a subcommittee yet. He noted that he would join the Planning Priorities Committee. C. Collins asked about E. Smith's attendance. B. Morgan replied that she was a new member that had not attended the last two meetings because she had been in a car accident.

T. Daniel asked how they should contact the members who had not joined a committee. D. Law replied that she had sent an email to these members approximately two weeks before the current meeting. T. Daniel then volunteered to contact those who had not yet joined a committee. The group identified nine members that were not members of a committee. D. Law stated that she would work with T. Daniel on a script for follow-up. T. Daniel replied that he would report back at the next Monitoring Committee meeting.

D. Law next stated that new member orientation would be held on April 20, and that new members would be invited to the next CPG meeting. T. Daniel suggested that they invite the chairs to attend the orientation meeting.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Approval of Minutes (26 August 2010):

Motion: T. Daniel moved, C. Collins seconded to approve the minutes from the August 26, 2010 meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from August 26, 2010
- Description of Open Nominations Process
- OHP Calendar

COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP (CPG)

Nominations Committee

Meeting Agenda

Friday, March 04, 2011

11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

The Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia

Call to Order/Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Report of Co-Chairs

Report of Staff

Discussion Items

- **Membership Application Review Process**
 - **Review Current Memberships and Gaps**
 - **Review Members' Attendance**

- **Next Steps/Next Meeting Date**
 - **New Member Orientation**

Old Business

New Business

Review/Next Steps

Announcements

Adjournment

The next Nominations Committee meeting is scheduled for TBA. It will take place at the Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA. 19107. Please refer to the Office of HIV Planning's attached Calendar of Events or its website, www.hivphilly.org, for updated committee meeting information.

**Community Planning Group
CPG Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, August 26, 2010
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107

Present: Chris Collins, Tony Daniel, Tricia Dressel (Co-Chair)

Absent: Khadeja Barnes

Excused: Andrea Johnson

Staff: Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

Call to Order/Introductions:

T. Dressel called the meeting to order at 2:13 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

T. Dressel presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** C. Collins moved, T. Daniel seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes (21 July 2010):

T. Dressel presented the July 21, 2010 minutes for approval. **Motion:** T. Daniel moved, C. Collins seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Co-Chairs:

T. Dressel stated that she would no longer be a member of the CPG as of the September meeting. D. Law asked when T. Dressel would officially resign. T. Dressel replied that her resignation would take effect at the end of the day.

Report of Staff:

D. Law stated that she had contacted the members in violation of the attendance policy as requested at the previous meeting, and that only W. Briscoe and V. Sowell had responded. She went on to say that W. Briscoe planned to improve his attendance, which had suffered due to work commitments, and V. Sowell was considering resigning due to work conflicts, though she had requested input from the committee. T. Dressel suggested that V. Sowell resign and attend meetings as a guest, so they could fill her slot with someone who would be better able to participate. D. Law then noted that she had not heard from R. Feely, D. Samuel, or D. Lienau.

Discussion Items:

• **Review Current Membership and Gaps**

D. Law reviewed the current membership, noting that the white columns did not include T. Dressel's or V. Sowell's resignations. She then stated that there were also two members that the committee was planning to remove for violation of the attendance

policy. She went on to say that the handout included their ideal membership goals that would best reflect the epidemic, noting that they were seeking more African-American males. T. Dressel stated that current membership was more reflective of the epidemic than it had been in the past. D. Law also pointed out the affiliation and expertise gaps as listed.

• **Review Members with Attendance Issues and No-Shows**

C. Collins asked for more information about A. Johnson's attendance, as she had previously been nominated for co-chair of the Nominations Committee. D. Law replied that she had spoken with A. Johnson, who had explained that she had had work conflicts, though she was still interested in the co-chair position. She noted that they had previously agreed to remove K. Barnes and A. Chhabria if they did not attend the previous day's CPG meeting, which they had not. T. Dressel noted that N. Deroose was on a leave of absence because he was abroad. She then stated that D. Samuel had eight absences, while R. Feely had seven. She noted that D. Lienau had not been present, and K. McGarvey represented the state. D. Law added that A. Davis was still interested.

T. Dressel suggested removing all those with six or more absences, including Khadeja Barnes, Arti Chhabria, Rick Feely, Denette Lienau, Dionna Samuel, and Val Sowell. She noted that Ken McGarvey was on the state CPG, and Nicholas Deroose had a leave of absence. The group unanimously agreed to remove A. Chhabria, K. Barnes, R. Feely, D. Lienau, and D. Samuel. D. Law noted that they would then have 25 members.

• **Start Membership Application Review Process**

C. Collins asked when they would review the next round of applications. B. Morgan replied that they would seat new members in April. C. Collins then asked how many members they were required to have on the CPG. B. Morgan replied that they needed to have 20-35 members, so the group could approve as few as zero and as many as ten of their new applicants.

T. Daniel stated that they had twelve applications, including four community members and eight providers. He went on to say that he supported having more community members so they can better reach the population. T. Dressel stated that they did not know that the providers were not also community members, since some could be both. T. Daniel stated that if he selected as a primary area of expertise as an individual, then he would have put his own address rather than his organization. He explained that he was a provider, but he applied as an individual. C. Collins stated that he understood this and thought that they should have more community input, but that it would be most important to have involved applicants. T. Dressel then stated that they were making assumptions since many people felt as though they were a part of the community as well as providers. She then asked what T. Daniel meant when he referred to "community." T. Daniel replied that many of those that did not attend meetings were not able to come due to their work in the field. T. Dressel stated that they could not say that providers were not also consumers, and it was beyond their scope to assume that people could not be providers and fierce advocates for their communities as well. C. Collins then stated that the process had historically been provider-heavy, but that it

would be important to have providers at the table too. He went on to say that providers at the meetings could share the content with their agencies as well as community members. He also explained that many community members did not want to or were unable to come to the meetings at their current times. He then suggested doing more targeted recruitment, adding that they could also consider changing the meeting times.

D. Law stated that they did have three providers that disclosed their positive statuses for their applications. T. Dressel then stated that they were asking for affiliations from applicants, so they would need to ask a specific question related to a preference for people that were applying as community members. She then suggested "do you feel like a member of the community or a provider" or a similar question to capture this. She added that this could be a difficult question. C. Collins stated that it might help to lengthen the application to four pages so they would be able to gain more clarity on the applicants. T. Daniel agreed that they would need to revisit this process, explaining that they had added seven new members in the last round, but they were already removing five and losing two other members.

T. Dressel stated that any discussions on the composition of the CPG and targeting recruitment should be held with the entire CPG. She suggested creating a survey on this for members in the future. The group then agreed to review applications, starting with the best-scoring applicant.

The group first reviewed #106, which had had the highest score of all applications. D. Law noted that this person had attended the last two meetings. T. Dressel then reviewed highlights of this application. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application.

T. Dressel then noted that they should have conversations about their scoring and what they were looking for before scoring the next round of applications.

The group then reviewed #113. C. Collins noted that he had scored this applicant low on "representation needed." T. Daniel reviewed this applicant's areas of expertise. C. Collins stated that he liked this application because of the expertise, although the applicant did not meet the demographic gaps. T. Dressel then pointed out that this applicant did fill a membership gap. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application.

The group next reviewed #103. C. Collins and T. Dressel both voted to approve this application, while T. Daniel abstained. T. Daniel explained that he was considering at-risk representation, and they had many representatives for MSM communities already. T. Dressel asked if the CPG had too many representatives for the MSM population. D. Law replied that they currently did not have too many representatives for the population, noting that they met all at-risk community gaps except MSM-IDU.

The group moved on to review #107. T. Dressel noted that this person had also applied for the RWPC. D. Law stated that this person had been a member several years ago

when members could be on both the CPG and the RWPC. C. Collins stated that this applicant did not score well for him. The group unanimously decided not to approve this application due to representation concerns, and since this applicant also applied for the RWPC.

The group then reviewed #108. T. Dressel stated that she had not originally scored this applicant very well, but that she then saw there was a gap in epidemiology. C. Collins asked if a person filling this gap would need to be an epidemiologist. D. Law replied that the applicant would have to identify themselves as an expert in epidemiology. She noted that this applicant had attended a CPG meeting and had previously contacted the Office to express interest. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application.

The group next reviewed #105. T. Dressel noted that #105, #110, and #112 all had the same score. T. Dressel stated that this applicant met the needed demographics. C. Collins pointed out that this applicant would be considered youth. D. Law noted that this applicant had attended a CPG meeting. T. Daniel stated that the community co-chair was looking to revive the YRT, and that they needed more youth in order to do this. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application.

The group moved on to review #110. T. Dressel pointed out that this applicant had identified as a provider, but also stated that he or she was a graduate of Project TEACH. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application.

D. Law noted, at this point, they had four available slots remaining for CPG members.

The group then discussed #112. T. Dressel reviewed this application. D. Law noted that this applicant had also applied for the RWPC, and she believed that this person was more interested in the RWPC. The group unanimously agreed not to approve this application.

The group next discussed #104. T. Dressel pointed out that this applicant had included MSM-IDU as his or her affiliation. C. Collins noted that the CPG did not have much representation from this organization, although the demographics were not ideal. The group unanimously agreed to approve this application due to community representation. T. Daniel noted that they would be reviewing attendance again in the spring, so they might lose current members before that time.

The group moved on to review #109. T. Daniel and C. Collins voted not to approve this application, while T. Dressel abstained. T. Daniel stated that he did not think there was enough information about affiliation, expertise, and representation included in the application.

The group then discussed #111. C. Collins stated that he did not think that this applicant understood what the CPG was. The group expressed confusion over some of the answers on the application. B. Morgan noted that this person may have wanted to

apply for the RWPC instead, as he had been at several RWPC meetings before. The group unanimously agreed not to approve this application.

The group next reviewed #102. D. Law reminded the group that they had reviewed this application once before, and asked to review it again in the future. She noted that this person had applied in October but not yet attended a meeting. The group unanimously agreed not to approve this application, and suggested inviting the applicant to attend meetings.

D. Law stated that they were waiting for one current member to reapply. The group agreed to approve this current member when he or she reapplied.

• **Next Steps**

T. Dressel stated that the committee would review both the application and the scoring process at their next meeting, with the intent of presenting any changes at the following CPG meeting. C. Collins then asked if A. Johnson planned to return to the committee meetings. D. Law replied that she had not been attending meetings, although she had said she was still interested in the committee co-chair position. T. Dressel asked if they could vote A. Johnson into the co-chair position if she was not present. D. Law replied that she would have to be present to accept. T. Daniel pointed out that the group might need to have a special meeting to elect a new co-chair.

The group agreed to hold their next meeting on Wednesday, September 8. T. Dressel then asked staff to email CPG members, requesting their participation on the Nominations Committee.

Old Business:

C. Collins stated that they had planned to apply the CPG attendance policy to the subcommittees as well. He noted that M. Castillo had stated that they would need to include this new requirement in both the application and orientation, and that they would need to stress the importance of attendance. T. Daniel replied that he believed they were already emphasizing the need to attend subcommittee meetings, and that they would need to further discuss the language for the subcommittee attendance policy. B. Morgan noted that there would be both Nominations and Monitoring Committee meetings before the CPG meeting, so they would be able to discuss this issue at both of those meetings.

C. Collins stated that the committee had discussed having an open house to encourage community involvement the previous year. D. Law replied that the Office held an open house at St. Luke's the previous fall, and the Positive Committee would be having another open event at St. Luke's on November 9, although it would not be CPG-specific.

T. Dressel suggested having the group discuss their calendar for the coming year during their September meeting, since the committee would be taking a break after that. D. Law replied that the committee could choose to meet in October.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

T. Dressel stated that this would be her last Nominations Committee meeting.

T. Daniel stated that the coming weekend would be the 47th anniversary of the “I have a Dream” speech.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from July 21, 2010
- OHP Calendar

DRAFT

Philadelphia Prevention Community Planning Group (CPG)

Description of Open Nominations Process

Revised 27 March 2003

The following steps shall be utilized to solicit, review, recommend, and appoint new members to the Philadelphia Prevention Community Planning Group. It is expected that this process will be utilized at least annually.

Step One. Solicitation of Members

The Office of HIV Planning advertises the availability of seats on the CPG through local media outlets and through distribution of applications at places where interested parties are likely to have access to them. The application shall include open-ended questions and conflict of interest information (including the CPG's policy and disclosure form).

Step Two. Application Review

The Nominations/Membership Committee assembles a review panel of CPG members to conduct application review. The panel shall be comprised of no fewer than 3 members and should strive to reflect the demographics of the epidemic in Philadelphia. *The committee shall recommend applicants for membership twice during the planning cycle, once in the spring and once in the fall period.* Utilizing objective criteria, each panel member completes an independent review of each application reflecting whether or not an applicant should be appointed to the CPG. The review panel members evaluate each of the applicant's responses on the application separately, utilizing the following criteria:

Understanding of the CPG

Skills/Experiences of the Applicant Relative to HIV Prevention

Representational Needs of the CPG

Applicant's Clarity regarding their contribution to the CPG

Each panel member then scores each of the applicant's responses based upon the following range:

1=Clearly fulfills this criteria.

2=May fulfill this criteria.

3=May not fulfill this criteria.

4=Clearly does not fulfill this criteria.

The panel may consider additional documentation including, but not limited to, meeting attendance records for applicants seeking appointment for an additional term. Each panel member submits his or her ratings to the Office of HIV Planning staff. The staff tabulates results and develops a score sheet showing each reviewer's ratings for each applicant along with a cumulative rating for each applicant. The staff convenes a

meeting of the review panel to discuss the applications and ratings. In assembling its recommendations for membership, the panel shall also consider the list of categorical seats that are to be filled, paying attention to demographics of the epidemic locally, as well as the applicants' cumulative rating.

The list of candidates, along with the group's overall rating for each, is then sent to the CEO (Chief Executive Officer for the CDC HIV Prevention award) or the CEO's designee for consideration. The review panel may make additional recommendations to the CEO (such as a recommendation for representation by geographic area, recommending candidates for specific seats, etc.). This application review step may require more than one meeting of the review panel.

Step Three. Review and Appointment by CEO or CEO's Designee

The CEO or designee reviews the panel's recommendations and, after full consideration, makes all appointment decisions. Each applicant is notified as to whether or not s/he is appointed and for what term length. Candidates not selected for appointment remain in the applicant pool for future consideration.

Step Four. Filling Vacancies

The CEO or designee fills vacancies from among candidates whose applications have been reviewed by the Council's review panel. If a vacancy arises for which there are few qualified applicants, the review panel may solicit additional applications for review and recommendation to the CEO or designee, utilizing the process described above. Applications may be submitted throughout the year; the application review panel may be convened as needed to review these applications so that candidates may be considered when filling vacancies.

Key Points To Keep In Mind During Application Review

Give weight to the objective criteria and scoring process in place.

Objective criteria are there to help manage biases and keep the process transparent and fair.

All applicants must be given equal consideration based on the information contained in the application.

Attendance record of re-applying members is relevant to the decision-making process.

Remember that representation and reflectiveness rely on fulfillment of the **representation categories AND demographics equally.**

The CPG has a goal (bylaws) that a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the members are people with HIV infection and/or people from communities at high risk for HIV infection.