

PREVENTION PLANNING GROUP (PPG)

Nominations Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

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

Call to Order/Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes (*March 04, 2011*)

Report of Co-Chairs

Report of Staff

Discussion Items

- **Membership Application Review Process**
 - **Review Current Memberships and Gaps**

- **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
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