

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A (Title I) EMA  
Nominations Committee**

Meeting Minutes of  
**Thursday, August 13, 2009**  
**12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Tom McCoy, Emery Troy, Lorrita Wellington

**Excused:** Dafne Armstrong, William Brawner (Co-Chair), Kevin Burns (Co-Chair), Michael Cappuccilli

**Absent:** Alicia Beatty, Gary Bell

**Staff:** Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

**Call to Order/Introductions:**

T. McCoy called the meeting to order at 12:37 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda:**

T. McCoy presented the agenda for approval, noting that they would have a brief overview of applications but no approval, due to the lack of attendance at the meeting. The agenda was approved by general consensus.

**Approval of Minutes (July 9, 2009):**

T. McCoy presented the July 9, 2009 minutes for approval. The minutes were approved by general consensus.

**Report of Staff:**

None.

**Report of Co-Chair:**

None.

**Discussion Items:**

• **Brief Review/Overview of the Nominations Process**

N. Johns reviewed the Key Points to keep in mind during Application Review (*see – attached handout*). She explained that there were a lot of things to weigh and measure when looking at applications, including membership categories and demographics. She noted that the RWPC has a goal to have 50% consumer representation, in addition to the legislative mandate of 33% non-conflicted consumer representation. She pointed out that there were several consumers among the applications. T. McCoy asked what the actual definition of consumer is. N. Johns replied that it is someone that uses Ryan White services, although they use a looser definition of anyone that is HIV-positive. She noted that a consumer would be non-conflicted if they were not an employee or a board member for a Ryan White Part A organization. She reminded those present of the previous sheet that they had that showed them their gaps in representation.

D. Law stated that the Planning Council representation sheet (*see – attached handout*) showed them the percentages for membership. She explained that HRSA only reviews the percentage of unaligned consumers. She stated that there are some consumers that were previously employees of agencies, but they become unaligned when they leave that organization. She went on to review why they needed a panel to review applications, rather than using the entire Nominations Committee. She noted that at least 50% of the panel had to be consumers. T. McCoy asked if they needed six people in the meeting for review, or just six people to score the applications. D. Law replied that they needed six members to score, but they did not need six people at the meeting. T. McCoy stated that this committee was then different from the other committees, and that they were required to match the demographics of the epidemic with the panel. He explained that they would have to discuss the importance of being on the committee with the Planning Council. D. Law explained that anyone could be a part of the Nominations Committee, and only the panel for review of applications needed to match the demographics. T. McCoy stated that it would still be important to try to have a bigger pool of members to choose from for the panel. D. Law noted that they did not have any representation from the PA Counties on the Nominations Committee. T. McCoy stated that it would be important to recruit someone from the PA Counties. N. Johns noted that this was all self-regulated, and that it was included in their bylaws. T. McCoy asked if the 50% consumer rule was from the Planning Council. N. Johns agreed. T. McCoy noted that this was important information to have. He pointed out that they would not be penalized in terms of their award if they did not meet the demographics. D. Law noted that when they do not follow their bylaws, it could make their process grievable.

D. Law stated that those present had a sheet outlining changes that they had made to their scoring process (*see – attached handout*). T. McCoy stated that the switch in scoring had been very easy. D. Law noted that a person reapplying should be considered alongside everyone else rather than being given preference. She pointed out that she had looked at the gaps, and identified which applications filled those gaps. She cited Hepatitis C as an example. T. McCoy asked if they ask who has Hepatitis C on the applications. D. Law replied that they did not, but they do ask who can represent the population. T. McCoy verified that this had been on the application for a long time. D. Law noted that HRSA had separated out Hepatitis C as a representation category. She pointed out that there were certain gaps that would not be filled in this round. She then explained the Philadelphia EMA Ryan White Part A Planning Council Membership Reflectiveness Chart Fall 2009 (*see – attached handout*). D. Law explained that applicants pick a primary and secondary representation category. N. Johns stated that they have to fill out a chart in the application, and that the secondary representation area is just to help them for their records. B. Morgan explained that having Hepatitis C would not necessarily cause a prospective member to be comfortable representing the population of people with Hepatitis C. D. Law stated that primary and secondary representation were more important than anything else. She noted that their Hepatitis C applicant had Hepatitis down as their area of expertise. N. Johns noted someone may not be able to talk about their demographic with expertise simply because they fit a certain demographic. D. Law explained that they have to fill the gaps in the sheet first, which was more important than the race of the applicant. T. McCoy stated that they could ask members of the Planning Council if they have Hepatitis C in order to fill the category. D. Law replied that they had previously had representation for the category, but the gap was new. B. Morgan added that they previously had a Hepatitis C

coordinator that moved out of state, and that she had been very helpful. D. Law noted that this applicant stated that he might or might not attend the meeting later that day. T. McCoy stated that he understood the difficulty with the demographics, and that he had been under the impression that they would count those with Hepatitis C as they count consumer membership.

D. Law moved back to explain the membership sheet, noting that the second column showed what they would have if they did not put any reapplicants back on. She then indicated the third table, which would be their ideal membership. She next went back to review the demographics on the membership gap sheet. She noted that they might want to remove people with attendance issues to better reflect the demographics.

T. McCoy stated that he had been surprised to hear about some of the attendance issues. D. Law noted that they may want to consider the members' responses to the warning letters in their decisions. T. McCoy stated that N. Shein was involved with everything on the Planning Council, and really got her hands into all of her work. D. Law noted that #102 was a consumer male from New Jersey that was also a prevention provider. T. McCoy stated that this applicant had answered a few questions, but left a lot of answers blank. D. Law noted that #107 was blank and #108 may need interpretation. L. Wellington asked if they could notify people to let them know their application was incomplete. N. Johns replied that they had not done that before. D. Law stated that #113 did not have page 4 in the mail or in the fax.

D. Law noted that had talked to M. Pletcher, that he had not submitted an application due to health issues, and that he was interested in reapplying. She went on to say that she had spoken with H. Pack's coworker, and that he would not be able to reapply for this term, but there was someone else from his organization applying. T. McCoy stated that #113 had a very detailed application, and asked if it was missing page 4 because of the additional info on the back of the application. B. Morgan stated that a question on page 5 said 'see attachment' and that this was referring to the additional information on the back. T. McCoy asked if it would be ok for him to write down the answers on the application on M. Pletcher's behalf over the phone. N. Johns replied that she did not see why this would be a problem, since this had been done for applicants needing translation.

D. Law explained that the purpose of the membership gap sheet was to help them understand the documents better. T. McCoy asked if the list of gaps was a recommendation for staff. N. Johns explained that this showed them when they could fill multiple gaps with one person.

- **Review/Follow-Up on Attendance for Warning/Removal**

D. Law stated that she sent out eleven warning letters, and she heard back from N. Shein with a note that her attendance would improve, while G. Bell sent a note back with a check mark. She noted that J. Grant had sent a letter of resignation, and M. Andrews had simply returned the letter with no note. She added that they ask them to give a reason, and read the letter aloud. T. McCoy asked if they could review that letter at their next meeting. D. Law explained that some had checked a box, some wrote an explanation, and some did not respond at all. She stated that she had emailed, called, and mailed T. Kaba but did not hear

back from her. She noted that her term was up. She went on to say that C. Morales had not replied to her. T. McCoy noted that C. Morales came in June, and he would contact him. D. Law stated that R. McLean was a newer member that did not attend orientation or any meetings. The group agreed to remove this member. D. Law went on to say that J. Roderick had come to Orientation, but had not been to any meetings. The group agreed to remove J. Roderick. B. Morgan noted that he had not participated in any of the committees either. D. Law stated that J.S. Smith had never been to a meeting, and his phone was disconnected. The group agreed to remove this member. D. Law noted that T. Stancil had been talking about moving back to Texas, so she might not be in the area any longer. The group decided to remove this member. D. Law stated that G. Thomas's phone number did not work. N. Johns noted that G. Thomas had not been to a meeting for the past year. The group decided to remove her, as well as R. Thomas. B. Morgan noted that A. Wallace would be coming to that afternoon's RWPC meeting.

D. Law asked what they should do in regard to G. Bell's attendance issues. T. McCoy replied that he had had long-term issues with attendance. He asked if they could ask for someone else from the organization that would be an active member. N. Johns suggested a program manager. E. Troy suggested removing this member, noting that he could always appeal the decision. T. McCoy suggested asking G. Bell for a recommendation for someone else at his organization. D. Law replied that they had previously asked that of him, but that they had never received an application from his organization. N. Johns suggested trying to do recruitment not from the top down, but from the bottom up. T. McCoy stated that he could talk to employees at BEBASHI to see if they would like to participate.

- **Next Steps**

D. Law suggested next Thursday for the second Nominations meeting.

**Old Business:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from July 9, 2009
- RWPC Attendance Chart
- Membership Reflectiveness Chart
- Fall 2009 Membership Gaps and Needs
- Membership by Category
- Key Points to Keep in Mind During Application Review
- OHP Calendar

**RYAN WHITE PART A PLANNING COUNCIL (RWPC)**  
**Nominations Committee**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**Thursday, August 13, 2009 12:00p.m.-2:00 p.m.**  
The Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia

---

**Call to Order/Introductions**

**Approval of Agenda**

**Report of Staff**

**Report of Chair**

**Discussion Items**

- Brief Review/Overview of the Nominations Process and Documents
- Membership Application Review/Discussion
- Review/Follow-up on Attendance for Warning/Removal
- Next Steps
  - Next Meeting Date if Necessary
  - Orientation for New Members

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Announcements**

**Adjournment**

**PLEASE TURN ALL CELLPHONES AND PAGERS TO SILENT OR VIBRATE.**  
*The next meeting of the Nominations Committee is Thursday, September 10, 2009 12p.m.-2:00p.m. at 340 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Please refer to the Office of HIV Planning calendar of events for committee meetings & updates ([www.hivphilly.org](http://www.hivphilly.org))*

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A (Title I) EMA  
Nominations Committee**

Meeting Minutes of  
**Thursday, July 9, 2009**

**1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Dafne Armstrong, Kevin Burns (Co-Chair), Waleska Maldonado, Lorrita Wellington

**Excused:** Michael Cappuccilli, Tom McCoy, Emery Troy

**Absent:** Alicia Beatty, Gary Bell, William Brawner (Co-Chair)

**Guests:** Victoria Bailey, William Cooper, Tyrone McCray

**Staff:** Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

**Call to Order/Introductions:**

K. Burns called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. A moment of silence and introductions of those present followed.

**Approval of Agenda:**

K. Burns presented the agenda for approval. The agenda was approved by general consensus.

**Approval of Minutes (May 14, 2009):**

K. Burns presented the May 14, 2009 minutes for approval. **Motion: D. Armstrong moved, T. McCray seconded to approve the May 14 minutes. Motion passed: All in favor.**

**Report of Staff:**

None.

**Report of Co-Chair:**

None.

**Discussion Items:**

• **Review/Follow-up on Attendance for Warning/Removal**

K. Burns stated that he had spoken with A. Beatty and G. Bell and both wanted to remain on the Planning Council and the committees. He went on to say that he had left a message for J. Benitez, and R. Thomas's phone had been disconnected. T. McCray stated that his pet project had been surrounding attendance, and that there were quite a few people that were not attending not only committee meetings but Planning Council meetings as well. He went on to say that he was amazed that G. Bell had only been to

one meeting in six months, and if had they followed the bylaws, these people should have been removed. He then stated that people that do not attend meetings are not helping them to get the job done, and there are lives at stake. He noted that these members had continually been in violation, had been warned, and were still on the Planning Council. He went on to say that the representation from G. Bell and A. Beatty could be taken care of by others at their organizations. He noted that the committees are important and the work has to be done, and that all fifty-five members needed to be involved.

K. Burns stated that there had previously been a discussion around a certain person because of her representation. N. Johns replied that they could ask her to recommend someone else that would be able to attend meetings. K. Burns asked if they had a similar issue with any others in violation of the attendance policy. D. Law asked those present to review the membership by category worksheet (*see - attached handout*). She noted that they currently did not fill all of the categories. K. Burns replied that this showed that they ought to recruit for empty categories. N. Johns stated that it would be alright for them to have a short-term gap in certain representation categories as long as they put a new member on from that category in the fall.

K. Burns agreed with T. McCray's point that no one would take the policy seriously if they did not enforce it. D. Armstrong stated that someone that was removed would feel more pressure to attend in the future. She went on to say that people with attendance problems do not bring fluid thinking to the table.

K. Burns then reviewed the list of members with attendance issues. T. McCray stated that they at least had to remove people from the committees they did not attend, if not the Planning Council. D. Armstrong stated that they should take people off if they had never come to a meeting since they were put on the Planning Council. D. Law explained that they had an issue with maintaining a high enough percentage of unaligned consumers. N. Johns stated that it might help them to have a better support mechanism. T. McCray stated that people that made it this far should know what the rules are. He went on to say that they should remove providers that do not attend meetings to better serve the consumers. He then said that they could count on consumers to be in the meeting more because they did not have so many competing things on their attention. N. Johns stated that they have to enforce any rule across the board, not just for consumers or just for providers. K. Burns stated that they had previously kept people on the Planning Council because they needed the numbers. D. Armstrong stated that they should look at whoever has ten absences and review that list first. She went on to say that they had to look at who these people were. D. Law said that they should start with the RWPC sheet first, and pointed out R. Thomas, J.S. Smith, M. Pletcher, A. Wallace, G. Bell, M. Andrews, J. Grant, P. Houle, C. Morales, N. Shein, T. Stancil, G. Thomas, and T. Kaba as those in violation of the attendance policies. D. Armstrong suggested looking at whether these people attend committee meetings. The group agreed that M. Andrews came to Finance Committee meetings. K. Burns stated that she had all excused absences, which was a consideration. He then noted that she only had five absences so she was not in violation yet.

K. Burns stated that G. Bell had stated that he would make an effort to attend, although he had never attended his committee meetings. T. McCray stated that the rules were for everyone. They pointed out that J. Grant had six absences on the committees and five on the Planning Council. D. Law stated that P. Houle has a medical condition. T. McCray asked why this exempted him. D. Law replied that this was in the bylaws. The group agreed that T. Kaba did not participate in a committee and had Planning Council attendance issues. D. Law pointed out that C. Morales had only joined the Needs Assessment Committee in May, and M. Pletcher was out on health issues. The group continued down the list, noting that N. Shein had had five excused Planning Council absences and two Finance Committee absences. They then moved on to discuss J.S. Smith, who was not on a committee and had not come to any meetings. K. Burns stated that they would need to remove R. Thomas as well. D. Law stated that another member was on Positive Committee. The group discussed removing G. Thomas and T. Stancil. K. Burns stated that they had identified six people to remove, and that they should look at the applications they had coming in at their next meeting to weigh the possibilities. He stated that they should send letters to all twelve members in violation that they will be removed. He said they should include the number of absences they have had, the policy, and that they were being considered for removal based on their attendance. He added that the letter should say that they will be considered for removal at their August committee.

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

D. Law stated that there were twelve members with expiring terms.

- **Review Revised Membership Application**

D. Law stated that the new application was down to six pages and that the committee would need to approve this for the Planning Council to review it (*see – attached handout*). K. Burns pointed out that this had gone from eleven pages to six pages. D. Law went on to point on the changes made as suggested at their previous meeting.

**Motion:** T. McCray moved, D. Armstrong seconded to recommend the approval of the new application at the Planning Council meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor. K.

Burns asked if he would need to add this to the agenda at the Planning Council meeting. D. Law agreed.

- **Next Steps**

D. Law stated that they would have applications to review in August, and that they may need to have a second meeting in order to have seating of new members in September. She noted that she would send an email to committee members regarding the new applications, and that she could send them out ahead of time. She then pointed out that they needed at least six people to score applications.

- **Old Business:**

N. Johns stated that staff hopefully would have more information on the open house in August.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:52 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from May 14, 2009
- RWPC Application for Attendance
- Planning Council Representation
- Subcommittee Attendance Records
- Planning Council Attendance Records
- OHP Calendar