

**Philadelphia HIV Prevention Community Planning Group
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, September 16th, 2009
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Chris Collins, Tony Daniel, Andrea Johnson

Staff: Joseph Ellis, Debbie Law

Excused: Robin Brennan (Co-Chair), Tricia Dressel (Co-Chair)

Absent: Ingrid Abrams

Call to Order

T. Daniel called the meeting to order at 1:24 pm.

Approval of Agenda

After the group took a moment to review the agenda for the meeting, they approved the document by general consensus.

Approval of Minutes (*August 31st, 2009*)

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

Report of Co-Chairs

None

Report of Staff

D. Law directed the group's attention to the handout entitled *Key Points to Keep in Mind during Application Review*. As the committee read over the document, D. Law noted that it would be much more difficult for them to work towards their goal of PLWHA comprising 50% of the CPG because the question concerning applicants' positivity status had been removed from the new application.

Discussion Items:

• **Continue Application Review Process**

D. Law took a moment to explain some aspects of the handouts to the committee before they started to review the applications. She noted that, on the *CPG Membership Reflectiveness Chart*, the white columns represented the current CPG membership, the yellow columns represented the current CPG membership minus four members with attendance issues who would be discussed later, and the peach column represented the new applicants minus the three current CPG members who were reapplying. As the group read through the *Community Planning Group Representation Gaps* handout, D. Law informed

them that the CPG would have a gap in IDU representation if the committee decided to remove one member of the planning body who had serious attendance issues and could not be reached despite repeated attempts at contact. The members of the Nominations Committee then spent a few minutes reviewing the documents on their own.

T. Daniel asked whether the reapplying members of the CPG had good attendance records. D. Law replied that, while the terms of five CPG members were expiring, only three were reapplying. She told the group that only one of the three reapplying members had missed a notable number of meetings; however, she clarified that the individual had been on maternity leave at the time.

C. Collins asked whether any of the new applicants worked for the same agencies and, thereby, could raise concerns about overrepresentation. D. Law replied that, although one applicant worked for the Mazzoni Center, the individual had been contracted by the agency. Additionally, she said that a few of the applicants worked for CHOP but in different departments. T. Daniel noted that some individuals could find it questionable that both he and C. Collins worked for the same agency as one of the new applicants. In response, C. Collins stated that CPG members were supposed to represent their communities and not the organizations they worked for. T. Daniel agreed and clarified that he had only made the comment so that the group could address the potential conflict. He then suggested that the committee only approve candidates who would create an overrepresentation of an agency on the CPG if they could fill a specific representation gap for the planning body. The rest of the group agreed.

The group decided to start their process by reviewing the applications with the lowest, or best, scores. However, before they began, D. Law noted that applicant 115 had just been accepted to the Ryan White Planning Council and, therefore, could not be a member of the CPG.

T. Daniel felt that it would not be necessary for the committee to review the applications with scores of 6.33 or better. He explained that, because CPG membership was at such a low level, it would be justifiable for the group to simply accept the candidates who had scored so well. The rest of the group agreed; however, C. Collins reminded them that they still had to ensure that agencies would not be over-represented on the CPG, as they had just decided. As a result, the group went through the applications and determined that candidates 106 and 107 would need further justification for approval than their scores alone. D. Law informed the group that applicant 106 had already attended a CPG meeting. She also noted that, although both of the applicants worked for the same organization, they were in different departments. C. Collins pointed out that because of their gender and ethnicity, applicants 106 and 107 would represent two communities that were greatly affected by the epidemic. Each member of the group then gave their approval to the two applicants.

C. Collins said that he approved of applicant 123 because he represented MSM and because he was with an organization whose members tended to be passionate about HIV-related issues. D. Law informed the group that the individual in question had submitted his

application in response to an advertisement on craigslist, saying that he wished to represent his community. A. Johnson also gave her approval to applicant 123, which gave him a recommendation despite the disapproval of T. Daniel.

D. Law pointed out that applicant 102 had scored poorly in the representation category. However, she said that the individual had previously attended a CPG meeting. All members of the group then gave their approval to applicant 102, citing her representation of the faith-based community and her status as a PLWHA as their reasons.

T. Daniel did not approve of applicant 112 because the individual would not bring any new representation to the CPG. The rest of the group supported his decision.

C. Collins pointed out that applicant 124 would fill the CPG's representation gap of an STD governmental agency. As a result, he gave his approval to the applicant and the rest of the group supported his decision.

D. Law informed the group that applicant 119 had already attended a number of CPG meetings. C. Collins stated that he felt as though the applicant's attributes more than compensated for the fact that she worked for an organization that was already well-represented on the CPG. In addition to her positive attendance habits, he explained, the candidate's extensive experience in program evaluation could be of great use to the CPG. A. Johnson agreed, giving approval to the applicant 119. T. Daniel did not give his approval to the individual.

Each member of the group disapproved of applicants 113, 121, and 122 based on their poor scores and the fact that none of the applicants would fill any representation gaps on the CPG.

C. Collins stated that he approved of applicants 114 and 104 despite the fact that neither individual would fill representation gaps because they were highly experienced and had clearly put a great deal of effort into completing their applications. A. Johnson supported the approval of both applicants, noting that, in addition to the points made by C. Collins, the two individuals represented a growing population in the city. T. Daniel did not approve of either applicant; however, both were approved for membership.

As the group had completed their review of applications, D. Law took a moment to review their decisions. She said that, out of twenty-four applications, the committee had approved nineteen, three of which were current members of the CPG who were reapplying. Additionally, she reiterated that four applicants – 112, 113, 121, and 122 – had been rejected and that application 115 had not been reviewed because the individual had just been accepted on the Ryan White Planning Council.

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

D. Law informed the group that four members of the CPG were in serious violation of the attendance policy. She explained that three of the new members approved during the last seating had yet to attend a single meeting and that one standing member of the CPG had

not attended a meeting or been in contact with the OHP for nearly a year. **Motion:** C. Collins moved and T. Daniels seconded to remove the four members of the CPG in violation of the attendance policy. **Motion Passed:** All in favor. D. Law clarified that the individuals in question would not be removed from the CPG until the new members were seated so that the planning body would not drop below its minimum membership level.

Old Business

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

The group decided to table this discussion item until N. Johns was available to participate in it.

New Business

None

Review/Next Steps

The committee took a moment to review their decisions and next steps:

- After reviewing twenty-four applications for membership on the CPG, the group gave their approval to sixteen applicants.
- Additionally, the committee removed four members for severe attendance violations
- The next meeting of the Nominations Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, October 21st, from 1:00 – 3:00 pm.

Announcements

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 3:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Ellis, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes (*August 31st, 2009*)
- Key Points to Keep in Mind During Application Review
- OHP Meeting Calendar

COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP (CPG)

Nominations Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, September 16, 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

Discussion Items

- **Continue Application Review Process**
- **Members with Attendance Issues and No Shows**

Old Business

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

New Business

Review/Next Steps

Announcements

Adjournment

*The next Nominations Committee meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 21, 2009 from 1-3pm**. 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
Monday, August 31st, 2009
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

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

Staff: Joseph Ellis, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law

Excused: Ingrid Abrams, Robin Brennan (Co-Chair)

Absent: Andrea Johnson, Tony Daniel

Call to Order

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

Approval of Agenda

T. Dressel suggested that the group end their meeting at 3:00 pm because she had to leave at that time and C. Collins was the only other member of the committee in attendance. C. Collins agreed and D. Law suggested that the group use the shortened meeting time to review the Nominations process and score the applications. The rest of the group agreed and then approved the revised agenda by general consensus.

Approval of Minutes (*May 20th, 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

N. Johns reported that the recruitment efforts undertaken by CPG members and OHP staff over the summer seemed to have been effective. Presumably as a result of the activities, she explained, there were twenty applications for the committee to review. She concluded her report by telling the group that, after they had finished making their nominations decisions, their next steps would be to target specific gaps in membership and find ways to better retain members.

D. Law informed the group that, although there were currently twenty-three members on the CPG, three were new members who had never attended a meeting and one was an older member who had not attended a meeting in over nine months. T. Dressel suggested that the committee review member attendance after they had completed the next seating of new CPG members. The rest of the group agreed.

Discussion Items:

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

D. Law directed the group's attention to the handouts provided for the meeting. As the members of the Nominations Committee looked over the documents, she informed them that there were enough open seats on the CPG for all of the new applicants if they removed the four previously mentioned members who had not been attending meetings. She clarified, however, that three of the twenty applications for review were from current members who were reapplying. Additionally, she noted that a few of the applicants worked for the same agency. She reminded the group that having numerous members working for the same agency could be viewed as a conflict of interest, even though the Bylaws did not contain any dictates on the matter.

N. Johns pointed out that some of the applications asked for an individual's HIV status while others did not. She explained that, after a few of the applications had already been dispersed, OHP staff had recalled that an authorization for the release of confidential information needed to accompany any statements about a person's HIV-positive status. As a result, she continued, the question had been removed from the application. However, she reminded the group that having positive people on the CPG was a stated goal in the Bylaws. Additionally, she noted that, due to the current state of CPG membership, whether or not an applicant filled a missing gap in membership was more important than their demographic details.

- **Start Application Review Process**

T. Dressel and C. Collins spent some time scoring the new applications. After they had completed the task, T. Dressel asked whether it was possible to set a minimum score for applicants to reach in order to become CPG members. She explained that, by setting such a score, the group could feasibly do away with their usual discussion of applications to expedite the process. D. Law said that setting a minimum score for new applicants was a possibility. However, T. Dressel recalled that the group still needed to hold a September meeting in order to discuss the community planning open house.

Old Business

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

Tabled until next meeting

New Business

None

Review/Next Steps

- The Nominations Committee reviewed the nominations process and scored twenty new applications.
- The group's next scheduled meeting date is Wednesday, September 16th from 1:00 – 3:00 pm.

Announcements

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 2:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Ellis, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes (*May 20th, 2009*)
- CPG Nominations Exercise
- Key Points to Keep in Mind During Application Review
- OHP Meeting Calendar

DRAFT