

**Philadelphia HIV Prevention Community Planning Group
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 20th, 2009
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Robin Brennan (Co-Chair), Robert K. Burns, Chris Collins, Tony Daniel

Staff: Joseph Ellis, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Mari-Ross Russell

Excused: Ingrid Abrams, Tricia Dressel (Co-Chair), Andrea Johnson

Call to Order

R. Brennan called the meeting to order at 1:24 pm.

Approval of Agenda

After reviewing the agenda, the group approved the document by general consensus.

Approval of Minutes (*March 18th, 2009*)

The Nominations Committee spent some time reviewing the minutes from their last meeting. Afterwards, they approved the document by general consensus.

Report of Co-Chairs

None

Report of Staff

None

Discussion Items

• **Review/Overview of the CPG Open Nominations Process**

N. Johns directed the group's attention to the handout entitled *Key Points to Keep in Mind During Application Review*. She said that, occasionally, the Nominations Committee and OHP staff discussed application reviews shortly after going through the procedure in order to identify any possibly improvements in the process. She noted that the handout listed the most critical aspects to the application review process in order to aid in their discussion. R. Brennan stated that it was difficult to recall specifics about the last review of applications since the process had taken place two months ago.

R. Burns noted that, despite the fact that he had been on the Nominations Committee for many years, he had never seen the *Key Points* handout before. He then asked why the committee was being provided with the document at the current meeting. M. Ross-Russell replied that she had requested the development of a short document listing the major points of the nominations process for both the CPG and the RWPC. She explained that she had felt as though a brief reminder would be beneficial both to new members and to long-standing members, who occasionally forgot about some of the smaller details of the

process. R. Burns agreed with the need for a concise reminder of the major points of the nominations process. However, he noted that the handout stressed the equality of representation and demographics categories and, having read the minutes for the last meeting, he asked whether the document was a response to the seemingly intense discussions that had occurred during the review of applications. He then apologized for having been absent from the previous meeting and noted that the difficulties in making applicant decisions could also have resulted from the high amount of membership turnover in the Nominations Committee. N. Johns agreed that the recent changes in the membership of the Nominations Committee could have added to the difficulties in decision-making. However, she stated that the motivation behind developing the *Key Points* handout had only been to foster a better understanding of the nominations process for all those who were involved with it. She clarified though that the document stressed the equality of representation and demographics because, while race, age, and gender tended to receive a lot of focus during nominations discussions, expertise and experience were often overlooked. C. Collins felt that the last review of applications would have gone differently if the group had been specifically told that expertise and demographics were equally important. He said that it was difficult for him to consider all factors equally during the review of applications because he had heard on many occasions about the importance of accurately representing the demographics of the disease within the membership of the CPG. As a result, he requested that OHP staff point out when specific applicants would fill a need on the CPG during future application reviews. The rest of the group agreed.

C. Collins asked whether 50% of the CPG membership was HIV positive, which was listed as a goal of the CPG on the handout. M. Ross-Russell replied negatively; however, she noted that the goal was not legislatively mandated as it was for the Ryan White Planning Council. Additionally, J. Ellis pointed out that the “and/or” part of the language allowed for HIV negative CPG members to satisfy the goal as long as they were from communities at high risk for HIV infection.

C. Collins suggested that the review of the nominations process take place no more than two weeks following the procedure because of the difficulty that the committee was having in recalling details about the process. The rest of the group agreed and R. Brennan added that the review could take place in a shorter meeting or even by conference call in order to make scheduling easier.

T. Daniel felt that the *Key Points* handout should be included with the meeting packets during application reviews. He informed the group that he was not very familiar with the Bylaws, which he said made it difficult to keep all the smaller points in mind while reviewing applications. In such a setting, he continued, it was possible for bias to enter into discussions and trump some of the guidelines of the Bylaws. C. Collins agreed with T. Daniel’s statement, saying that the handouts currently provided during application reviews contained too much information and were difficult to use as points of reference. The rest of the group agreed.

D. Law took a moment to review the changes in the application review process that the committee had requested. She said that, at future application reviews, the Nominations

Committee would be provided with the *Key Points* handout and OHP staff would point out when a candidate would fill a representation or expertise gap on the CPG. Additionally, she continued, within the two weeks following all future application reviews, the Nominations Committee would reconvene for a short meeting to discuss the process. She then informed the group that the RWPC Nominations Committee had recently changed their scoring method to make a higher score the better score, which was more intuitive. She asked the group whether they too wanted to alter their scoring method accordingly. However, the members of the Nominations Committee felt that they already knew the scoring process well enough that such an alteration was unnecessary.

- **Ex-Officio/Non-Voting Member/Guest Form & Process/Structure**

D. Law passed out draft copies of the *Community Planning Group First-time Visitors Information Card*. She then reminded the group that, in addition to having to approve a version of the guest card, the committee also had to decide on the process by which it would be used. M. Ross-Russell said that the CPG Co-Chairs could announce at each meeting that individuals who were interested in contributing without becoming full members could do so by simply attending meetings. Afterwards, she continued, the Co-Chairs could request that first-time guests fill out one of the cards. T. Daniel stated his approval for the draft of the guest card and the rest of the group agreed.

M. Ross-Russell stated that the group also had to make a decision about how to deal with governmental representatives on the CPG. D. Law reminded them that, during the last application review, the group had approved an individual for ex officio membership only because she was affiliated with the Health Department. However, she continued, there was currently no ex officio membership on the CPG. M. Ross-Russell replied that, if the committee decided to have the Co-Chairs make announcements about non-members participating in meetings, then governmental representatives who were not approved for full membership could be encouraged to participate in their letters of rejection. C. Collins and R. Brennan both gave their approval to the suggestion. R. Brennan added that having only two levels of membership – guests and members – would keep the process simpler for all who were involved.

- **Hold Letters**

M. Ross-Russell informed the Nominations Committee that the CPG potentially had a problem with its membership level. She explained that, if the group went through with the rejection of a current member's application, as had been decided at the last meeting, the CPG would be below its minimum of twenty members. D. Law specified that the CPG would be down to eighteen members if the rejection went through after R. Burns' membership expired at the end of the month. M. Ross-Russell reported that, as a result of the CPG membership level issue, she had not sent out the rejection letters from the committee's last application review because doing so would have violated the CPG Bylaws.

R. Burns suggested that the Nominations Committee engage in an intensive recruitment effort to try and raise the CPG membership above the minimum level. However, M. Ross-Russell pointed out that the OHP and the CPG were already engaged in recruitment efforts.

Additionally, she noted that any additional efforts would not yield new members in time to avoid going below the minimum membership level, which would occur at the end of the month if no new members were admitted.

R. Brennan asked whether the OHP had received any new applications for CPG membership. D. Law replied that two new applications had been received. However, she pointed out that the committee could also re-review the twelve new applications that they had denied at their last meeting. C. Collins suggested that the group review the two new applications and then re-review the twelve denied applications. However, D. Law noted that the new applications had not been scored. As a result, C. Collins stated that he would like to re-review the recently denied applications. He reminded the committee that they had deliberated for a while on some of the applications which they eventually rejected.

T. Daniel asked whether it would also be possible to lower the minimum membership level to eighteen. He clarified that the lower minimum level would not have to be permanent, but rather a temporary change to deal with the current situation. R. Brennan agreed with the idea, noting that eighteen members would still be more than half of thirty-five, the maximum membership level. However, C. Collins felt that lowering the minimum membership level would be a disservice to the city of Philadelphia. He stated that the group was responsible for making sure that membership levels met expectations, not to lower the expectations. T. Daniel stated that he did not feel as though lower the minimum membership level would be equal to lowering standards but rather a method of dealing with the current situation.

M. Ross-Russell suggested that the group set a minimum score for applications to meet in order to be approved. She explained that setting a minimum score would make the approval process easier, especially if they decided to re-review the rejected applications from the past meeting. D. Law pointed out that the scores from the previous application review could be organized into three separate ranges. She explained that 4 – 6.6 were the best scores, 7 – 8.8 were the middle range, and 12.8 – 13.8 were the worst scores. R. Brennan suggested that the committee re-review the applications they had denied which fit into the top and middle categories as described by D. Law. The rest of the group agreed. Having shredded the blinded copies of the applications, D. Law said that she would have to make some new copies for the group to review. The members of the Nominations Committee decided to continue with the other discussion items on their agenda while waiting for the copies to be made.

- **Fall Open House (RWPC & CPG)**

N. Johns reminded the group that the OHP had been planning to hold a community planning open house event in June as part of the ongoing recruitment efforts. However, she said that a lack of both planning time and responses from CPG members had caused the office to reconsider its plans. She explained that the OHP had decided to reschedule the open house for sometime in the fall in order to more thoroughly plan the event. R. Burns agreed with postponing the open house to allow for better planning. However, he asked whether the new CPG application could be distributed at the Prevention Summit so as not to completely miss the recruitment opportunities created by AIDS Education Month. N.

Johns replied that OHP staff already had plans to table and give a presentation on community planning at the summit. In addition, she said that the office would be handing out information at other events during AIDS Education Month.

T. Daniel asked whether the OHP would be tabling at the Youth Prevention Summit as well with the hope of attracting more youth to the CPG. D. Law replied that she had submitted a form to R. Brennan to request tabling at the event. However, R. Brennan said that she had not received the request and, therefore, asked D. Law to resend it. T. Daniel and C. Collins both offered to assist in tabling at the Youth Prevention Summit.

Old Business

- **Nominations Member to Join/Sit-in PPC or Lit & Ed?**

C. Collins reminded the members of the Nominations Committee that, in the months that they did not convene, they were supposed to attend the meetings of either the Planning Priorities or Lit & Ed Committees.

- **Recognition of Membership Letter**

D. Law asked the group whether they wanted to develop a letter to give recognition to CPG members whose terms were expiring, as had been mentioned at their last meeting. However, none of the members of the committee felt that the idea was worthwhile.

- **Re-review of Applications**

R. Brennan stated that she initially had felt positively about applicant #101 because the individual had an attached reference letter from another member of the CPG. R. Burns took a moment to review the applicant's demographic information, expertise, and experience. He then stated his disapproval for the applicant, saying that the individual would not bring any new representation to the CPG. T. Daniel, R. Brennan and C. Collins all agreed.

Moving on to applicant #104, T. Daniel reiterated that he did not approve of the candidate. R. Burns reviewed some specifics about the individual and then gave his approval to the applicant, saying that his familiarity with activism, health planning, and Trans issues could help to address the paucity of prevention services targeting the population in Philadelphia. C. Collins reminded the group that part of the reason they had rejected applicant #104 at their last meeting was because they had already approved two other Trans candidates. R. Brennan stated that she had initially approved of applicant #104 because he was an FtM Trans, which she believed was lacking from the CPG membership. However, D. Law clarified that, out of the two Trans applicants who had been approved at the last meeting, one was MtF and the other was FtM. C. Collins and R. Brennan gave their approval to applicant #104, which granted membership to the individual.

R. Burns reviewed the experience and demographic information of applicant #110, pointing out that the individual was a current member who was reapplying. N. Johns informed the group that the person had attendance issues, both in CPG and subcommittee meetings. As a result, all four members of the Nominations Committee rejected the individual's

reapplication. R. Burns pointed out that applicant #110 also did not add any necessary expertise or representation.

After R. Burns reviewed the information on applicant #116, C. Collins gave his approval to the individual. He said that he felt as though the candidate's experience in CTR and working with Latino populations would be a helpful addition to the CPG. Additionally, he pointed out that the applicant's status as a PLWHA would help the CPG move closer to its previously mentioned membership goal. R. Burns noted that the committee had given the candidate a score of seven, which was relatively good. He and R. Brennan then gave their approval to the candidate, which granted membership. T. Daniel abstained from voting.

R. Burns started the process for applicant #105 by reviewing the individual's information. Afterwards, he, C. Collins, and R. Brennan all stated their disapproval for the applicant, saying that her knowledge of epidemiology was likely insufficient for the CPG's needs. T. Daniel stated that he had initially wanted to approve of the candidate because of her professional background. However, he said that he disapproved of the applicant because the brevity of her responses made it seem as though she was not passionate about HIV prevention. The group then clarified that, having approved of two new applicants, the CPG would now maintain its minimum membership level.

New Business

- **Review Terms of Members and Take Appropriate Actions for Reminders, etc.**

D. Law informed the group that the items listed in the bullet point would be what the group discussed at their next meeting. The group then decided to cancel their June meeting because of the many conflicts that were presented by AIDS Education Month.

Review/Next Steps

M. Ross-Russell reported that, at the last Monitoring Committee meeting, the group had decided that all future committee reports in CPG meetings would be written to save time and to better document the process. To ease the process, she continued, the group had also decided that all subcommittee meetings would end with a review of decisions that had been reached and of next steps to be taken. The Committee made the following decisions during the meeting:

- Moving forward, OHP staff will provide the Nominations Committee with a condensed list of key nominations concerns each time they review applications.
- Within a two-week period following every application review, the Nominations Committee will have a short meeting to discuss the process in an attempt to identify areas in need of improvement.
- The Nominations Committee approved a draft of a guest card to be available at all CPG meetings to collect information on individuals attending a meeting for the first time.
- The group decided that an announcement would be made at every CPG meeting to ask first time guests to fill out the cards and to encourage any other guests to attend meetings as regularly as possible even if they were unable to commit to full voting membership.

- Because the CPG was in danger of going below its minimum membership level as defined by the Bylaws, the Nominations Committee re-reviewed 5 applications that had been rejected at their last meeting. They approved two of the applicants.
- OHP staff informed the group that the previously considered open house in June was no longer an option due to insufficient planning time. Afterwards, the group discussed other ideas for recruitment efforts, including an open house sometime between August and October and distribution of applications and flyers at various prevention-related events.
- The group reiterated that they were to attend either the PPC or the Lit & Ed Committee meetings in months that the Nominations Committee did not convene.
- The Committee decided not to develop a letter of recognition for CPG members whose terms were expiring, an idea that had been previously mentioned.
- The Committee's next steps will be to review attendance and membership term expirations and to continue planning for recruitment activities.

Announcements

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Ellis, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes (*March 18th, 2009*)
- CPG Nominations Exercise
- Key Points to Keep in Mind During Application Review
- OHP Meeting Calendar

COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP (CPG)

Nominations Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, May 20th, 2009

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

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

Call to Order/Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Report of Co-Chairs

Report of Staff

Presentation

- **Review/Overview of the CPG Open Nominations Process- *Nicole Johns, OHP***

Discussion Items

- **Ex-Officio/Non-Voting Member/Guest Form & Process/Structure**
- **Hold Letters**
- **Fall Open House (RWPC & CPG)**

Old Business

- **Nominations Member to Join/Sit-in PPC or Lit & Ed?**
- **Recognition of Membership Letter**

New Business

- **Review Terms of Members and Take Appropriate Actions for Reminders, etc. (*July or August?*)**

Review/Next Steps

Announcements

Adjournment

*The next meeting date and time of the Nominations Committee is **TBD**. 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.*

**Philadelphia HIV Prevention Community Planning Group
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 18th, 2009
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Ingrid Abrams, Robin Brennan (Co-Chair), Chris Collins, Tony Daniel, Andrea Johnson

Staff: Joseph Ellis, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law

Excused: Tricia Dressel (Co-Chair)

Absent: Robert K. Burns

Call to Order

R. Brennan called the meeting to order at 1:20 pm. D. Law informed the group that some additional CPG membership applications had been received since the last packet of applications had been distributed to the committee members for scoring. As a result, the members of the Nominations Committee decided to take a moment to score the additional applications before proceeding to their discussion on the new applicants. R. Brennan ensured that the listing of CPG representation gaps was included in the handouts, saying that she had based many of her scoring decisions on the document.

Approval of Agenda

After reviewing the agenda, the group approved the document by general consensus. R. Brennan reminded the group that, at the last CPG meeting, many of the members had had some issues with the non-voting member form. As a result, she felt that it was important for the Nominations Committee to cover the matter at their current meeting in addition to reviewing the seventeen applications for membership. Since those two items alone would likely take up the bulk of the meeting time, she felt that the group would have to schedule an additional meeting in April to discuss the rest of the items on the agenda.

Approval of Minutes (*February 18th, 2009*)

The Nominations Committee spent some time reviewing the minutes from their last meeting. D. Law pointed out that she had not been present at the last meeting, though she was included in the list of attendees. T. Daniel noted that, on page six of the minutes under the discussion of the open house/meet & greet event, it was stated that R. Burns had suggested scheduling the event in June so that it would coincide with AIDS Education Month. However, T. Daniel felt that he and R. Brennan had made the suggestion, not R. Burns. Additionally, he recalled that their discussion had also included a suggestion to hold another CPG recruitment event in December as part of World AIDS Day. He then noted his appreciation of R. Burns' stated support for the recruitment event in June, saying that the CPG would require all the assistance it could get. J. Ellis said that he would check

the recording of the meeting and make corrections on the matters accordingly. Having noted the three issues, the group approved the document by general consensus.

Report of Co-Chairs

None

Report of Staff

None

Action Item:

- **Finalize Membership Application Review for Recommendation**

As they had decided, the members of the Nominations Committee spent some time reviewing and scoring the new applications. During the process, A. Johnson noted that she had not received any copies of the applications and asked whether any had been sent to her for scoring. D. Law stated that she had not sent copies of the applications to A. Johnson. She informed her that she had distributed copies of the applications to the members of the Nominations Committee at the last CPG meeting, which A. Johnson had been unable to attend. Additionally, she said that she had sent A. Johnson three emails to confirm her mailing address because she needed to ensure that the confidential applications would be received before she could mail them. She stated that, because she had not received a response to any of the emails, she did not mail A. Johnson any copies of the applications. A. Johnson noted that she had been excused from the last CPG meeting and said that she had only received one email from D. Law on the matter within the last week. she stated for the record that it was always safe to send sensitive membership materials to her house because she would receive them. She told the group that she felt strange because she did not have any applications to look through and could not participate in the conversation. R. Brennan offered to share her applications with A. Johnson; however, A. Johnson said that she had just looked through them and was more interested in having had a chance to thoroughly review the applications before the discussion.

C. Collins stated that it was sometimes difficult to score applications without bias when the applicant's identity was apparent, even with their names and email addresses being blinded. D. Law asked whether she should also blind applicants' titles or organizations in order to make it more difficult to identify them. However, she noted that an applicant's organization could be necessary for determining what their contribution to the CPG would be. N. Johns pointed out that, in place of actual titles and organizations, OHP staff could fill in a generalized statement about the work that applicants did when blinding the applications for the Nominations Committee to review.

After the members of the Nominations Committee had finished scoring the new applications, D. Law left the room to compute the results and include them in an updated CPG Applicant Evaluation Sheet. R. Brennan suggested that the committee use the time to discuss the new application and the non-voting member form and the rest of the group agreed.

- **New Membership Application and Non-Voting Member Form**

R. Brennan reminded the group that, at the last CPG meeting, some members had not understood the need for both a regular application and a non-voting member application. Additionally, she mentioned that the idea of non-voting members had arisen from the OHP's need for demographic information on guests at CPG meetings, which she felt some members of the CPG had not understood. C. Collins reminded the committee that, at the last CPG meeting, some members had suggested allowing applicants to specify within the regular application whether they wanted to be full voting members or non-voting members, which would remove the need for two separate documents. He said that there was a need for non-voting members because some individuals who potentially had much to contribute to the CPG were unable to meet the requirements of full membership. He added that the application would have to clearly explain the difference between the two levels of membership.

N. Johns pointed out that having to complete a formal application, even with the option of selecting non-voting membership, could be very intimidating for some of the individuals who attended CPG meetings as guests. As a result, she suggested the creation of a short, informal card that would be used to collect necessary information from guests who were completely new to CPG meetings. She said that OHP staff could approach anyone who they did not recognize, ask them to fill out the card if it was their first time at a meeting, and answer any questions they might have about the CPG and its proceedings. Once individuals had attended a few meetings and were more familiar with the process, she concluded, they could fill out a regular application and decide whether they wanted to be full or non-voting members. She felt that utilizing such a procedure would remove barriers from community attendance because guests would not have to answer any questions that made them uncomfortable. She pointed out that, while full and non-voting members would have to put down their names, guests could remain anonymous if they so preferred. All in attendance supported the idea of a guest card. T. Daniel suggested providing guests with a packet of information about the CPG when they were given the cards to fill out. He also proposed adding guests to the CPG emailing list because he felt that individuals would more likely want to become full members if they were better informed.

T. Daniel suggested using the term "ex officio" instead of "non-voting member" for individuals who attended CPG meetings with some regularity but did not apply for full membership with voting privileges. He then proposed placing the option for ex officio membership and an explanation of its level of commitment under the first section of the application with the heading: "Please indicate whether you have served on the CPG previously." He also felt that ex officio members should have some responsibilities, though not as much as full members, in order to separate them from guests. However, he thought that such responsibilities would have to be worked out in a separate discussion.

D. Law asked whether the Nominations Committee would want to score and vote on applications for ex officio membership. C. Collins felt that the group should not bother to vote on non-voting members because, with the exception of a title, they would neither gain nor be denied any privileges through the approval or disapproval of the Nominations Committee. T. Daniel felt that the Nominations Committee should vote on potential non-

voting members. He said that denying non-voting membership from someone would not necessarily prevent them from attending a CPG meeting. I. Abrams pointed out that the CPG needed help from non-voting members, both governmental and community, because attendance at meetings had recently been so low. She then stated her belief that the committee should not vote on non-voting members because, although a rejection would not necessarily prevent them from attending meetings, it could act as a barrier. C. Collins felt that, if the group were to vote on non-voting applicants, they should only do so for those who came from governmental positions – ex officio members – and not those from the community. D. Law informed the group that there was no official distinction between ex officio members and non-voting members. She also noted that non-voting members of any type would not require letters from the Health Department for final approval of the committee's recommendations. C. Collins replied that, since governmental and community non-voting members were considered equal, they should not be treated differently. As a result, he said that he would prefer to not vote on either one of the non-voting applicant types rather than having to vote for both of them. T. Daniel felt that non-voting members could not be held to any level of commitment if their applications did not have to undergo an approval process. Additionally, he said that, if a non-voting member wanted to become a full member, there would not be any additional information available on them to inform the committee's decision. C. Collins stated that, while he understood the points that T. Daniel was making, he did not feel that the issues were important enough to warrant voting on non-voting or ex officio members. He then reiterated that the committee could not hold governmental and community representatives to different standards because it would appear that they were judging individuals separately based on their education. He felt that, regardless of whether non-voting members were voted in, governmental and community representatives would attend meetings differently because of their distinct motivations. He clarified that governmental representatives would probably attend more regularly because they were likely to already know some CPG members. Community representatives, he continued, would probably not attend meetings very regularly because they would not have a rapport with any CPG members and would probably have only a fledgling interest in the group initially. T. Daniel stated that he would agree with the group's consensus on whether or not to vote for non-voting members.

C. Collins asked whether guests could become ex officio members by simply filling out the guest card that N. Johns had suggested. D. Law felt that more information would be required on ex officio members than other guests if they were going to be held to a higher commitment level. She informed the group that J. Jenne acted like an ex officio member for the CPG because he was a governmental representative who always abstained from voting.

N. Johns felt that the idea of a non-voting member was unnecessary. She pointed out that most guests would likely not be interested in filling out a form to become an official non-voting member since the CDC already considered them as such by simply attending a meeting. D. Law reiterated that the idea of a non-voting membership form had come from the OHP's need to fulfill the data requests of the CDC. She said that, in the past, OHP staff had had to make guesses about guests' demographic information using only the names on the sign in sheet. A. Johnson suggested that staff explain to guests that they would have to

fill out different forms based on the membership level that they were interested in. T. Daniel proposed including a statement on the guest card that would advise individuals to talk to an OHP staff member if they wanted more information or were interested in becoming full CPG members. He informed the group that he had completed an application after talking to D. Law, who had explained the details of CPG membership to him. He suggested doing away with the term “non-voting member” and, instead, referring to all individuals who were new to CPG meetings as “guests,” who would receive the guest card at their first meeting. Continuing, he said that, if a guest wanted to become an ex officio or even a full member after attending a few meetings or talking to a staff person, they could fill out an application and check whichever option they preferred. All in attendance supported the idea.

D. Law reminded the group that they still had to decide whether to vote on ex officio members. However, she reiterated that it was not necessary to vote for them since they would not require approval from the Health Department. A. Johnson thought that the Nominations Committee could vote for ex officio members because they would complete an application, thereby giving permission for some level of review. R. Brennan did not think that the committee should vote on ex officio members because voting was the only privilege that was given to full CPG members. She pointed out that ex officio members who attended every meeting would still not be able to vote on any issues. T. Daniel stated that, through good persuasion, ex officio members would still be able to affect decisions even though they would not be able to vote. He pointed out that he had been able to affect the last application review even though he had not yet been able to vote. C. Collins asked whether the Nominations Committee could remove ex officio members who did not attend any meetings. N. Johns reiterated that all meetings were open to all members of the public and that voting was the only privilege given to full CPG members. As a result, C. Collins stated that the Nominations Committee should not vote on ex officio members since they would not be given anything that could be taken away. The rest of the group agreed.

T. Daniel asked the group whether they wanted to set a cap for a maximum number of ex officio members. He pointed out that, without a cap, there could be more governmental representatives at meetings than regular members, which he felt could be problematic. D. Law asked what part of the membership would be allotted to ex officio members. J. Ellis pointed out that ex officio members would not take up any of the thirty-five seats for regular CPG members. C. Collins stated that governmental ex officio members could still come to meetings in greater numbers than CPG members and, thereby, potentially push their own agendas. J. Ellis noted that, since all meetings were open to the public, governmental representatives could always come to meetings in high numbers, even if they were not accepted as ex officio members. R. Brennan felt that there was no need for a cap on ex officio members at the current time. N. Johns agreed, pointing out that the Nominations Committee could always decide not to accept any new applicants if they felt that a certain type of representation was dominating the membership. T. Daniel stated that he would rather put a cap in place before there was a problem and remove it later if it was deemed unnecessary. J. Ellis informed the group that the creation of an official cap on ex officio members would require changes to the Bylaws. N. John pointed out that Bylaws changes would hinder the committee’s ability to make decisions while simple policies

could easily be altered as necessary. She reiterated that, if there were too many ex officio members on the CPG, the Nominations Committee could simply decide not to accept any more. R. Brennan asked if rejected applicants were considered non-voting members. D. Law restated that anyone who attended a CPG meeting was a non-voting member, regardless of whether or not they had ever applied to the CPG.

Reminding the committee that they still had seventeen applications to review, R. Brennan suggested that they bring the current discussion to a close. J. Ellis asked for clarification on where the additional line to the application should be placed. He pointed out that the first section of the application, where T. Daniel had initially suggested placing the addition, asked for information on applicants' histories with the CPG. He felt that the section asking about the time that applicants could devote to the CPG might be more suitable to a question about the level of commitment they were interested in making. T. Daniel stated that he was not concerned with the location of the addition. N. Johns noted that the wording in the first section could also be altered to make it more suitable for the additional line.

D. Law asked the group if they wanted to table the discussion and revisit it at their meeting in April. R. Brennan agreed, however, she said that the committee would report to the CPG that they had decided to draft a single application with an additional line for selecting ex officio membership instead of having a separate document. Additionally, she said that the report would mention the guest card and the distinction between guests and ex officio members. J. Ellis pointed out that, if the committee continued to work on the details of the application at their next meeting, the CPG would not have a draft to approve at their next meeting and the old application would have to be used throughout the next seating cycle. However, R. Brennan stated that a new draft of the application could be presented to the CPG for approval at their next meeting. The rest of the group agreed with the decision.

- **Finalize Membership Application Review for Recommendation (continued)**

D. Law passed out copies of the updated CPG Applicant Evaluation form. She explained that the average scores had been calculated by dividing each of the totals by five because five members of the Nominations Committee had completed scoring sheets. She reminded the group that lower numbers meant better scores, explaining why the evaluation was organized by lowest to highest scores.

The group also spent some time discussing the applications and current CPG members in general. They determined that six of the seventeen total applications were from current CPG members who were reapplying, which left only eleven new applicants. It was noted that the CPG was currently below its minimum number of members because J. Lauby had resigned and C. Diaz had been out of contact with the CPG for many months. As a result, the group determined that, technically, all seventeen applications could be accepted. However, they noted that, based on some of the scores, such was not likely to be the case.

Following a suggestion by R. Brennan, the committee decided to organize their discussion by starting with the lowest, or best, scores and working their way through to the highest. Additionally, R. Brennan felt that the committee could simply approve the six best scoring applicants without the need for discussion. However, D. Law thought that the group would

want to discuss applicant #102 because the individual had scored somewhat poorly in the categories of representation needed and clarity of contribution. R. Brennan gave her approval to the applicant because she appeared knowledgeable about the CPG, was a former member, and had worked with many of the at-risk populations. She added that she knew the individual personally and felt that she would apply information she acquired at CPG meetings to the programs that she was involved with. D. Law and N. Johns stated that, when applicant #102 was a member of the CPG, she had had a good attendance record. The rest of the committee agreed to approve applicant #102.

D. Law pointed out that applicant #103 had not scored as well as #102 in understanding of the CPG and clarity of contribution. She then informed the group that applicant #103 had applied to the CPG before but had been denied. She felt that the individual would bring a great deal of expertise and skills to community planning and noted that, as an at-risk mother, she would fill a representation gap. R. Brennan believed that, since the individual was applying for a second time, she was highly interested in the CPG. She also noted that a six was a good score. The rest of the group agreed and approved applicant #103.

R. Brennan informed the group that her score for applicant #111 had been influenced by a presentation she had recently seen on Asian MSM. I. Abrams said that she had scored the applicant well because she had felt that he had shown interest in the CPG. D. Law pointed out that the individual was currently a member of the CPG. T. Daniel questioned whether the applicant was very committed to his current CPG subcommittee. He noted that, as the group started to develop their 5-year plan, they would need members who were assets and not liabilities. He said that he was questioning whether to re-accept applicant #111. D. Law stated that the individual was currently a member of the PPC and attended most meetings. R. Brennan voiced disapproval over the fact that the applicant had not filled out any information in section II of the application. Additionally, she noted that the CPG was not in need of representation by Asian Heterosexual populations. D. Law clarified that, following the application, the individual would represent Asian Heterosexual women, the population with which he worked. She then reminded the group that, during that last review of applications, they had denied membership to an Asian applicant because the population was over-represented on the CPG. T. Daniel clarified that the issue last time had focused on the fact that the applicant had not identified as the population they would have represented on the CPG. R. Brennan suggested putting applicant #111 on hold for the moment but noted that a score of 6.6 was pretty good. T. Daniel felt that 6.6 was not a very good score for a reapplying member.

R. Brennan stated that she was uncertain about applicant #116 as well. She noted that, as a Caucasian Heterosexual, his representation score was not very good. However, she felt that the applicant's status as a PLWHA could be beneficial to the CPG. C. Collins pointed out that, as an ex offender, the applicant could provide some insight into prison populations. T. Daniel noted that the applicant also identified as Latino, a demographic which was lacking from CPG membership. He also believed that, because the individual was positive, he could have been a man on the down low and not just Heterosexual. R. Brennan pointed out that seven was a relatively good score. C. Collins gave his approval to applicant #116 because, among other reasons, his affiliations made it seem as though he

was trying to learn about the prevention system. I. Abrams also approved of the applicant but noted that the group would never know how well applicants would perform until they were actually members. D. Law informed the group that, to her knowledge, the applicant had never attended a CPG meeting. T. Daniel said that he would go with the majority and approve applicant #116, adding that the CPG would have to provide encouragement to the new member when he arrived.

R. Brennan reviewed some of the demographic information for applicant #117. C. Collins stated that he had given the applicant a low score because of the organization with which she was affiliated. D. Law informed the group that application #117 had arrived with #116. T. Daniel replied that, if the group had to pick between the two applicants, he would rather choose #117. C. Collins felt that the applicant may not have fully understood some of the questions on the application. After much discussion by the group, R. Brennan and C. Collins both felt that #117 should be placed on hold and decided on after the other applications were reviewed because the applicant's representation of an at-risk population was unclear. D. Law pointed out that, on page 7, the applicant listed PLWHA as her primary at-risk community representation. T. Daniel stated that, moving forward with the development of the plan, the CPG would require members who could strongly represent their populations. He felt that applicant #117 was a good candidate because of the many at-risk populations she represented. D. Law informed the committee that three of the applicants represented Transgender populations. She then gave approval for applicant #117's statement that she was "always available for a worthy cause." Afterwards, the group approved of applicant #117.

Before moving on to applicant #104, T. Daniel asked whether the group would review #116 again following their discussion on #117. R. Brennan replied that the applicant could be discussed again if time allowed. She then reviewed the demographic information for applicant #104. D. Law informed the group that the applicant had attended a few CPG meetings. T. Daniel stated that he did not approve of the applicant because it seemed to him that the individual could have an underlying agenda and would prove to be more problematic than beneficial. In support of his suspicion, he cited the following statement from the application: "I was initially drawn to the CPG because I firmly believe that community members and frontline prevention workers should have a direct role in crafting and assessing prevention programming." He said that the statement made it seem as though the individual was looking for a fight. He then pointed out that the applicant did not offer any new representation. He then advised the group not to be emotional in making their decisions because the CPG needed only members who would work on the plan, not just those who were frontline prevention workers. R. Brennan voiced difficulty in making a decision on the applicant. She said that, while she understood the concern over the individual having a personal agenda, she felt that the statement could also be interpreted as a desire to have for the voice of frontline workers included in prevention planning. The group decided to place the application on hold.

Moving on to applicant #101, R. Brennan reviewed the individual's demographic information and pointed out that the applicant had been recommended by a current CPG member. She noted that the applicant's primary area of expertise was sexual health

education and that she would represent heterosexuals and adolescents. D. Law pointed out that the applicant would not fill any gaps in expertise. C. Collins stated that he did not approve of the applicant because Caucasian Heterosexual females were already overrepresented on the CPG. The rest of the group agreed with the decision.

R. Brennan started the discussion on applicant #109 by reviewing the individual's demographic and organizational representation. She said that she personally knew the applicant to be a dedicated individual and, therefore, gave her approval for recommendation. D. Law warned the group against accepting too many individuals from the same agency for conflict of interest reasons. She said that, while there was no language in the Bylaws on the matter, it was a guideline to be considered. T. Daniel stated that he would not give his approval to applicant #109 because he could not support any candidates with a score higher than seven. Directing the group's attention to page three of the application, C. Collins gave disapproval to the fact that the individual would sometimes have a conflict with the CPG's Wednesday meeting time. R. Brennan pointed out that the group had approved or was considering some individuals who had left that section of the application blank. She then stated her conviction that applicant #109 would be a great resource for the CPG because of the individual's knowledge and experience with many of the important at-risk populations. However, T. Daniel felt that the applicant might be more helpful to the CPG as a presenter rather than a full member. D. Law reiterated that the individual was one of a few new applicants who were affiliated with a specific organization and suggested that the group place the applicant on hold and then review all of those associated with the agency together. The rest of the group agreed to re-review applicants #116, #117, and #109 at the same time.

As R. Brennan was reviewing the demographic information for applicant #110, C. Collins stated that an 8.2 was not an appropriate score for a current CPG member. R. Brennan agreed but noted that the individual had written a good narrative for her application. D. Law informed the group that the applicant in question had been having some issues with poor attendance. The group then agreed to not reapprove the individual because they felt that she had scored too poorly as a current CPG member.

D. Law noted that applicant #105 worked for AACO in the Prison AIDS Project. She informed the group that the individual had been recommended for CPG membership by D. Acosta and that his recommendation had sparked the discussion on governmental representation and ex officio membership. T. Daniel and C. Collins stated that they would accept the applicant as an ex officio member but not as a regular CPG member with voting privileges. The rest of the committee agreed with the decision.

The members of the Nominations Committee decided unanimously not to grant membership to applicants #106, #108, and #107. Because of the limited responses provided to the answers in the applications, the group felt that the three applicants had not taken the process seriously.

The committee took a moment to review the applicant decisions they had made before revisiting their discussion on those that had been placed on hold. The group confirmed that

they had reapproved four current CPG members and recommended two new applicants for membership. Additionally, they noted that one current member's reapplication had been denied and that five applicants, including one current member, had been placed on hold. The group tallied how their decisions would affect membership and realized that, not including the five applications on hold, the CPG would only have 18 members. As a result, C. Collins gave his approval to applicant #111, the current CPG member whose application had been placed on hold. The rest of the group agreed with the decision.

The group spent some time re-reviewing the three applicants who were associated with the same agency: #116, #117, and #109. T. Daniel gave his approval to applicant #117 and denied the other two. He explained that, though he had initially supported applicant #116, he felt that #117 could better represent a variety of at-risk populations. Additionally, he noted that ex-offenders, the population that #116 would have represented, would likely be given a voice by applicant #105, the AACO representative who worked for the Prison AIDS Project. C. Collins and I. Abrams also gave their approval for applicant #117. R. Brennan reminded the group that they had initially been bothered by the applicant's statement that facilitating her recovery group was her primary expertise. D. Law noted that the applicant could have written the statement to demonstrate her leadership or facilitation skills. The rest of the group agreed and approved applicant #117.

C. Collins also gave his approval to applicant #109. As a result, R. Brennan pointed out that, since she approved and T. Daniel disapproved of applicant #109, the final decision was left up to I. Abrams. D. Law pointed out that applicant #109 had scored more poorly than applicants #116 and #104, who had also been placed on hold. N. Johns stated that, since the committee took the time to score the applications, they should ensure that the scores impacted their decisions. C. Collins stated that he had given applicant #109 a lower score for representation because, at that point, he had already seen two other applications from Caucasian Transgender individuals. R. Brennan pointed out that the CPG membership was low enough to argue for the approval of all three of the remaining applications. T. Daniel stated that, as an executive director, applicant #109 would probably appreciate seeing an employee taking a seat on the CPG instead of her. Additionally, he felt that the demands of applicant #109's position might prevent her from attending meetings regularly. I. Abrams gave her approval to applicant #109, which granted recommendation for membership.

Noting that their decisions left the CPG with only twenty-one members, R. Brennan and C. Collins gave their approval to applicants #116 and #104. However, T. Daniel said that, while he could potentially be persuaded to vote for applicant #116, he could not give approval to applicant #104. D. Law informed the group that applicant #116 had never attended a CPG meeting while #104 had been to at least one meeting. I. Abrams stated that she approved of neither applicant #116 nor applicant #104. As a result, neither of the individuals were approved for membership.

T. Daniel took a moment to thank the group for listening to his opinions about the various applicants. He said that he wanted the Philadelphia CPG to advance beyond its current state, which would require dedicated members who could both contribute to the

development of the prevention plan and properly speak for the populations they represented.

Discussion Items:

- **Non-Voting Member/Guest Form & Process/Structure**
- **Possible CPG Open House/Meet and Greet**

These discussion items were tabled due to a lack of time.

- **Next Steps/Next Meeting Date**

After discussing their individual schedules, the group decided to schedule their next meeting for Friday, April 17th, from 1:00 – 3:00pm.

- **Review terms of members and take appropriate actions for reminders, etc.**
This discussion was tabled due to a lack of time.

Old Business/New Business

None

Announcements

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 3:19pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Ellis, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes (*February 18th, 2009*)
- New CPG Application Draft
- Non-Voting Member Nomination Form Draft
- CPG Representation Gaps (*January 2009*)
- CPG Membership Representation Worksheets (Affiliation, Expertise, At-Risk Community)
- CPG Membership Reflectiveness Chart as of December 2008
- CPG Applicant Evaluation – Spring 2009
- OHP Meeting Calendar

CPG Nominations Exercise

The Nominations Committee has 6 applications to review. The group must decide who to recommend for appointment using only the information provided. The group can decide to recommend 3 or 4 applicants, but the group must be able to articulate why the particular applicants were chosen.

Applicant A: Caucasian heterosexual female (30s) working at a university with expertise in health planning and epidemiology.

Applicant B: African American MSM (over 45) working in a CBO with youth.

Applicant C: African American heterosexual female (40s) who is HIV+. She is an activist and peer educator.

Applicant D: Caucasian MSM (mid-20s) working with IDU population. He has attended a few CPG meetings.

Applicant E: Asian heterosexual female (30s) working with API and recent immigrant populations.

Applicant F: African American Transgender (MtF, 40s) who is HIV+. She works at an ASO.

Recommended for appointment:

Candidate	Reason for appointment
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

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.

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.