

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A EMA
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, March 11, 2010
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Dafne Armstrong, William Brawner, Kevin Burns, Lupe Diaz, William Gray, Waleska Maldonado, Lorrita Wellington

Excused: Michael Cappuccilli

Absent: Alicia Beatty

Staff: Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

Call to Order/Introductions:

K. Burns called the meeting to order at 12:13 p.m. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

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

Approval of Minutes (February 18, 2010):

K. Burns presented the February 18, 2010 minutes for approval. **Motion: L. Wellington moved, L. Diaz seconded to approve the February 18 minutes. Motion passed: All in favor.**

Report of Staff:

N. Johns stated that the Consumer Empowerment Workshop had gone very well, and that approximately 50 people stayed for the entire day. She went on to say that they had excellent feedback, and attendees were glad to learn how the funding works. She added that they gotten four RWPC applications, and that there were a great deal of people that had never participated in community planning.

B. Morgan stated that the Office's Facebook, MySpace, and Twitter accounts were now active. She explained that they would like to have more "fans" on the Facebook page, and asked those present to use the "suggest to friends" feature. She then added that they had gotten very good feedback on the Consumer Empowerment Workshop via Facebook.

Report of Co-Chair:

None.

Discussion Items:

• Bylaws Question on Membership Resignation

K. Burns explained that the co-chair of the RWPC had resigned from his position as co-chair as well as the RWPC, but there was no precedent for that. D. Law added that the bylaws did not include any references to resignations. D. Armstrong suggested that there be a formal record of resignations. L. Wellington questioned why they were giving much more attention to this resignation than other members' resignations. D. Armstrong went on to say that the resignations ought to be recorded in a separate document.

K. Burns stated that he understood that there was a meeting to follow up on this issue, and that the other co-chair had been involved. He went on to suggest that staff inform the committee whenever there is a verbal resignation so that it is documented somewhere. D. Law replied that the Office does inform the Nominations Committee whenever there is a verbal resignation. W. Brawner then emphasized the importance of moving forward.

D. Law stated that the only reference to resignation in the bylaws was, "Any member may resign from membership by written or other form of notice to the Office of HIV Planning." She then clarified that the group wanted to add language to the bylaws that would require the Office of HIV Planning to report resignations to the Nominations Committee. The group agreed.

• Follow-Up on Member Attendance

D. Law stated that they had discussed attendance issues of eight members at the previous meeting. L. Wellington replied that she had left messages for W. Maldonado and A. Mapp, but that she did not have a return call. She then suggested sending letters to those they had not heard from. W. Gray stated that he spoke to J. Wiggins, who would definitely not be able to attend due to work conflicts. D. Law stated that T. McCoy had contacted B. Langley, R. Hayward, and A. Wallace. She noted that they had heard from R. Hayward, who intended to continue to participate. She stated that A. Wallace's and B. Langley's phone numbers were disconnected, and that they had not attended meetings in some time. She added that J. Roderick had had consistent attendance problems.

K. Burns suggested sending a letter to those that they had not been able to reach. D. Law explained that they had thirteen applications for membership, and would have eight slots open. N. Johns asked if any of those in violation of the policy had never attended a meeting. D. Law replied that A. Wallace had not attended orientation and had only been to one or two meetings during his term. L. Wellington stated that it did not make sense to keep people on the RWPC if they were not attending meetings and were unreachable. She then suggested sending A. Wallace a letter and giving him five days to respond. D. Law replied that they did not have a good address for this member. The group then unanimously decided to remove this member.

K. Burns asked if anyone else was in a similar situation. D. Law replied that J. Roderick had attended orientation over a year ago, but had not been to a single meeting since. W. Gray stated that they should send him a letter, and automatically remove him if the letter was returned. K. Burns added that they should include a statement that he needed to contact D. Law within five days or he would be removed.

D. Law stated that there were six other people in violation of the attendance policy. K. Burns suggested that they send the same letter to everyone in violation of the policy. D. Law then suggested that they give them ten days to reply to the letter due to processing time at the post office.

• **Continue Membership Application Review Process**

D. Law stated that the group agreed that anyone that was present at the last meeting would be scoring again during the present meeting. She noted that the group had agreed to only have the same people score the second set of applications, but that there were only five members present that had attended last time. The group agreed to allow all those present to score.

D. Law stated that the co-chair position would be going up for nominations for 30 days, and asked the Nominations Committee co-chairs to facilitate this process. She added that they would elect a new co-chair at the April RWPC meeting. B. Morgan pointed out that the April RWPC meeting would occur after 28 days. The group then agreed to have a 28-day nominations period.

The group then took a break to score applications. D. Law calculated the scores (*see – attached handout*). She reminded the group that they had decided not to accept #105, and that they had put #107 on hold. She noted that #105 would not be able to attend any meetings, which was why they had rejected this applicant. She added that #107 was from New Jersey, which was why this applicant was on hold.

D. Law asked why #108 had scored so low. K. Burns replied that it was difficult to get information about this person. The group then agreed that it sounded like this applicant wanted to participate in order to have the RWPC on his resume. N. Johns asked how many of the top 9 scores were consumers. D. Law replied that 7 were consumers. L. Wellington stated that #108 answered the important questions on the applications.

K. Burns stated that they would hold the four applications left until the next cycle, unless they had people resign after receiving the letters for poor attendance.

• **Next Steps**

D. Law stated that she had scheduled the New Member Orientation for Thursday, April 1 at 11 a.m. She then invited the committee members to let her know if they planned to attend.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from February 18, 2010
- PC Applicant Evaluation
- OHP Calendar

RYAN WHITE PART A PLANNING COUNCIL (RWPC)
Nominations Committee
Meeting Agenda
Thursday, March 11, 2010 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

Approval of Minutes

Report of Staff

- Report Back on Empowerment Workshop Event

Report of Chair

Discussion Items

- Bylaws Question on Membership Resignation
- Follow Up on Member Attendance
- Continue Membership Application Review Process
- Next Steps
 - New Member Orientation (April 1st 11am-2pm)

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, April 8, 2010 12p.m.-2:00p.m. at 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Please refer to the Office of HIV Planning calendar of events for committee meetings & updates (www.hivphilly.org/calendar.html)

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A EMA
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, February 18, 2010
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Michael Cappuccilli, Lupe Diaz, William Gray, Tom McCoy, Emery Troy, Lorrita Wellington

Excused: Dafne Armstrong, William Brawner, Kevin Burns

Absent: Alicia Beatty, Waleska Maldonado

Staff: Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

Call to Order/Introductions:

M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

M. Cappuccilli presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** T. McCoy moved, W. Gray seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes (December 10, 2009):

M. Cappuccilli presented the December 10, 2009 minutes for approval. L. Wellington noted that she should have been listed as present, and L. Diaz pointed out that she had had an excused absence for that meeting. **Motion:** T. McCoy moved, L. Wellington seconded to approve the December 2009 minutes as amended.. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Staff:

D. Law stated that there would be a Consumer Empowerment Workshop at St. Luke's on March 9, and that they currently had approximately 30 RSVPs. She asked those present to encourage consumers to attend. She then added that they would arrange for special transportation needs, but that they would need five days' advance notice. W. Gray stated that his agency may also be able to provide transportation.

Report of Co-Chair:

None.

Discussion Items:

• Review Attendance Record and Take Appropriate Action

D. Law stated that they currently had 49 members, and seven of them were already in violation of the attendance policy (*see – attached handout*). M. Cappuccilli asked what

their goal for membership was. D. Law replied that they had a maximum of 55 members. She noted that they were also hoping to recruit new members from the Consumer Empowerment Workshop on March 9. She stated that they would begin the application review process during the current meeting, and finish the applications on March 11. L. Wellington asked if the attendance records included subcommittee attendance. D. Law replied that they did not, and that they had previously agreed to forward subcommittee attendance to the co-chairs of the subcommittees. She then explained that they had contacted members with attendance issues in the past. L. Wellington suggested reaching out to those violating the policy as they had done before. M. Cappuccilli asked if any of those on the list were contacted in the last cycle. D. Law replied that they were not. The committee members then volunteered to contact various members.

D. Law next pointed out that there were several other members that had missed meetings as well. L. Wellington volunteered to contact these members. D. Law stated that they would make decisions regarding attendance at their March meeting, so they could make space for new members if necessary.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they had gotten feedback on attendance issues from the subcommittee co-chairs. D. Law replied that the Needs Assessment Committee co-chairs had contacted their committee members. T. McCoy stated that it did not feel fair because there were not consistent rules. M. Cappuccilli asked what happened when a person attended all subcommittee meetings but not Planning Council meetings. B. Morgan replied that this did not happen. D. Law suggested that the committee work on some language regarding subcommittee attendance in the coming months. L. Wellington asked if the Positive Committee is technically a subcommittee. T. McCoy replied that it is, and that all subcommittee meetings were open to the public.

• **Review Current Membership and Gaps**

D. Law directed those present to review the breakdown of demographics on the Planning Council (*see – attached handout*). She explained that the chart on the left contained the current membership, while the chart on the right contained their goal membership. She pointed out that they would like to increase African-American membership from Philadelphia and the PA Counties, and male membership in Philadelphia and the PA Counties. She noted that they would also want to consider membership categories while review applications. T. McCoy pointed out that consumers were always top-priority. He then noted that they could be removing up to seven members that were consumers due to attendance issues.

D. Law stated that she and N. Johns had sent a mailing to their consumer mailing list to solicit applications, and that they also sent letters to providers. She noted that she had not received any new applications from this yet, but that they hoped to. She added that she had received seven applications so far, and that six were for new members. T. McCoy asked if any of the applicants filled the desired categories. D. Law replied that some of them did.

T. McCoy asked what a non-elected community leader would be. D. Law replied that this could be a pastor or another local community leader. M. Cappuccilli asked they would need more grantees for Part C or D. D. Law replied that they currently met the goal, but that they would have a problem if those members left.

• **Start Membership Application Review Process**

D. Law reminded the group that this would only be the first part of the application review process, so they would not make final decisions until their March meeting. She then asked those present to plan to attend the next month's meeting, in order to be more consistent in the application review. T. McCoy asked if D. Law would be mailing the applications to those that had not attended the present meeting, since the co-chairs were not present. D. Law replied that she would speak with K. Burns and W. Brawner about this.

L. Diaz asked what "clarity of contribution" referred to on the scoring sheet. D. Law replied that they look at the applicant's stated intents on the application. The group then individually scored the applications. M. Cappuccilli asked if #106 would fill the "formerly incarcerated" category. D. Law agreed.

D. Law stated that she would wait to tally the score sheets until the next meeting when they would have more applications. The group then began to discuss each application individually, beginning with #101. They agreed that #101 was knowledgeable, was a good participant in the process, and met the needed demographics. The group moved on to discuss #102. T. McCoy noted that this applicant had been attending Positive Committee meetings. The group agreed that there was not much information about this applicant, but that she was dedicated to attending the meetings. They then moved on to discuss #103. T. McCoy pointed out that this applicant met all of their demographic requirements, and could be a good addition to the RWPC.

The group next discussed #104, noting that this applicant fully met the needed demographics. M. Cappuccilli pointed out that this applicant had also answered the last question, which most applicants left blank. Then, the group discussed #105, pointing out that this applicant would not be able to attend meetings. T. McCoy stated that it would be important to ask this applicant to reapply in the future, if her schedule were to change. The group agreed that this applicant had filled other areas, but they would not be able to approve her. Next, the group reviewed #106. T. McCoy pointed out that this applicant met many of their demographic concerns. L. Diaz noted that this applicant worked at the same agency as her, and that their employer was very supportive of attending the meetings. Lastly, the group reviewed #107. The group discussed the difficulty of this application, since the application was excellent but the consumer was from New Jersey. The group decided to discuss the application again at their next meeting. D. Law noted that this applicant had turned the application in during August, but that he had been consistently attending Positive Committee meetings since then.

T. McCoy stated that they needed to reach out to consumers that will speak out for their communities. E. Troy stated that one of the difficulties was getting the consumers to

understand what happened at the meetings. T. McCoy stated that they tended to reach out to people that did not have a broad skill set, and that they needed to try to find the leaders in the community. D. Law stated that she would create a new reflectiveness chart based on the applicants they would like to put on the Planning Council to help them in their decision-making at the next meeting.

• **Next Steps**

D. Law stated that they might need to begin their March meeting at 11 a.m. if they received a large influx of applications, and that she would notify the group if that was necessary.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:47 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from December 10, 2009
- Membership Reflectiveness Chart Fall 2009
- RWPC Attendance October 2009 – September 2010
- Membership Applications
- OHP Calendar

