

RYAN WHITE PLANNING COUNCIL (RWPC)
Policy and Procedures Committee
Meeting Agenda
Thursday, April 8, 2010
12:00p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning 340 N. 12th St. Suite 203, Philadelphia PA, 19107

Call to Order

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Discussion Items

- **Attendance Policy**

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

Please turn Phone to Silent or Vibrate

If you require special assistance please let the office know 5 days in advance

The next meeting date and time of the Policy and Procedures Committee is TBA

It will take place at the Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th St. 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.***

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A EMA
Policy & Procedures Committee**

Meeting Minutes of

Tuesday, February 10, 2009

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

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

Present: Tyrone McCray

Staff: Briana Morgan, Mari Ross-Russell

Discussion Item:

• **Bylaws Review**

M. Ross-Russell stated that the committee language in the bylaws needed to be edited (*see – attached handout*). She stated that the Joint Coordination Advisory Committee does not exist, and she suggested removing the parts about committees working jointly with the CPG from the bylaws, with the exception of the Positive Committee. She noted that the only body that has members in both the RWPC and CPG is the Points of Integration Workgroup, which is not technically a committee. T. McCray agreed that it would make sense to remove these sections.

M. Ross-Russell explained that there used to be a CPG co-chair that would attend various RWPC committee meetings and report back to the CPG, which is where this language had come from. She noted that this had never been a committee charge.

T. McCray stated that he was confused because the bylaws say that the attendance is kept on a calendar year, but that he knew the Office tracked it by the planning year. M. Ross-Russell replied that they do their seating in September and March, so they run according to this year. She explained that they had previously discussed the problem of seating new members immediately before the allocations decisions would be made, and that the RWPC had decided to put new members on in April this year. She went on to say that attendance is based on when a person begins membership, not on the calendar year. T. McCray asked if they would be able to adjust the language to reflect this. M. Ross-Russell explained that when a person is removed from the RWPC, it is not because attendance is based on a calendar year or a fiscal year, but rather because this person did not attend meetings. She suggested changing the term to “within a 12-month period based on their membership anniversary date.” T. McCray agreed.

M. Ross-Russell stated that they would have to bring these changes before the RWPC to vote on, with a 30-day review period. She explained that it would not come immediately as an action item since there were no other committee members present. She noted that these were simply corrections to make the bylaws more accurate, so this should not be an issue.

T. McCray asked if it would be important to meet with the rest of his committee members before the Planning Council saw the edited bylaws. M. Ross-Russell replied that this was not a policy change, but only housekeeping, so it would not be necessary to meet separately about this. She explained that the importance was the intent of the language. She went on to say that there could be an issue regarding absences at the end of one planning year and at

the beginning of the next year combined. She asked T. McCray if he wanted to change the attendance policy language. T. McCray replied that he did not.

T. McCray stated that there were many people on the Planning Council that did not attend meetings and were still members. M. Ross-Russell replied that there needed to be a distinction between excused and unexcused absences. She suggested talking about the membership attendance policy with Nominations, since she was not sure if they intended the policy to follow the planning year or to be on a rolling cycle.

M. Ross-Russell explained that the purpose of the Office was to uphold the decisions of the Planning Council and to inform them of any important information. She went on to say that this ought to be presented to the Planning Council as a language update. She explained that the nature of the Planning Council is federally dictated, while the CPG is contractual. She explained that the CEO (the mayor) selects a designee to appoint members to the Planning Council, since that is what the legislative language requires.

M. Ross-Russell next explained that the Nominations committee reviewed blinded applications, and then the requirements around the epidemic as well as the current demographic information. T. McCray asked who made the final decisions on new members. M. Ross-Russell replied that Nominations gives recommendations, but that it is ultimately up to the Health Department to accept the recommendations or to alter them.

T. McCray asked about the percentage of consumers on the Planning Council, pointing out the 50% consumer membership goal. M. Ross-Russell replied that the requirement was 33%, and that they had approximately 38 – 40%.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Bylaws
- OHP Calendar