

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

Meeting Minutes of

**Thursday, November 10, 2011**

**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:** Candy Bogatz, Kevin Burns (Co-Chair), Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Lupe Diaz, William Gray, Emery Troy

**Excused:** William Brawner, Princess Graham

**Absent:** Tim Barlow, Alicia Beatty

**Staff:** Debbie Law, Briana Morgan, Nishika Vidanage

**Call to Order:**

K. Burns called the meeting to order at 12:14 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda:**

K. Burns presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Approval of Minutes** (*September 22, 2011*):

K. Burns presented the September 22, 2011 minutes for approval. M. Cappuccilli clarified that he had been troubled by perceived communication regarding the removal of the member, rather than the removal itself. While reading the minutes, C. Bogatz stated that she had not previously thought about making the environment at social events as comfortable as possible for those in recovery. K. Burns then clarified that they would be going to a restaurant that would have a number of food options. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli moved, K. Burns seconded to approve the minutes from the September 22, 2011 meeting as amended. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Report of Co-Chair:**

None.

**Report of Staff:**

D. Law stated that they had six new RWPC members, five of which had attended orientation. She went on to say that the member that was not able to attend orientation had wanted to know when she could become a member, since attending orientation was a requirement for membership. She then stated that the Nominations Committee had the option to request that she abstain from voting until she was able to attend the orientation in the spring. M. Cappuccilli stated that a part of the purpose of becoming a member was to be able to vote. He then suggested that that they abide by their rules and require her to attend meetings, but not allow her to vote. K. Burns asked if this topic was addressed in the bylaws. D. Law replied that this issue had been addressed on a case-by-case basis,

but that the bylaws stated that a member was not officially a member until he or she attended orientation. K. Burns stated that he thought it would be good for this new member to attend the next orientation, and suggested offering the option to abstain from voting for issues that she did not fully understand. L. Diaz agreed that this would be a good idea. D. Law then stated that the Nominations Committee would have the option in the future to amend its formal process.

D. Law next stated that they may have two more new members that would need mentors.

C. Bogatz stated that she thought that the orientation had gone well, and while some information had been very general, it was important to ensure that everyone was on the same page. She went on to say that she thought this was an important part of joining the RWPC. M. Cappuccilli stated that he felt that the orientation was rushed toward the end, and suggested choosing less information to present. D. Law explained that they spent an unusual amount of time on the beginning of the orientation because there were many questions. C. Bogatz stated that she had liked the discussion at the beginning. D. Law noted that they had tried encouraging current members to participate, but that it had been somewhat disruptive. K. Burns suggested using the small conference room for the orientation to prevent interruptions. C. Bogatz then asked how often orientation was provided. D. Law replied that this was done every six months. M. Cappuccilli stated that it could be helpful to attend orientation for a second time after attending several meetings. D. Law noted that they had begun to invite new members to an RWPC meeting the month before they were seated. C. Bogatz replied that this had been helpful for her, as she had chosen to apply after seeing the application on the website.

#### **Discussion Items:**

##### **• New Member Follow-Up Survey Results/Membership Retention Ideas**

D. Law stated that twelve new members had joined the RWPC in 2011, and that eight of those new members had responded to the follow-up survey. She went on to say that 100% of respondents had felt that the RWPC addressed the needs of PLWHA. She further stated that they had improved the number of consumers on the RWPC, and that the RWPC was also making an effort to be more open and inclusive. C. Bogatz agreed, explaining that she had seen more consumers in RWPC meetings than in any other meetings she had attended elsewhere. K. Burns then pointed out that one respondent had been concerned about his or her ability to attend meetings if he or she were to find a full-time job, and suggested considering this when scheduling meetings. B. Morgan replied that this issue had been discussed both in the Positive Committee and internally with OHP staff. She explained that moving the meeting times could negatively impact some of those that were able to attend the daytime meetings, but that this could also open meetings to a larger group. N. Vidanage noted that the Baltimore EMA RWPC held some of its meetings at night.

K. Burns stated that the results were very positive, and thanked Office staff for making many of the changes. M. Cappuccilli replied that he saw challenges within the results. He went on to say that more new members should “strongly agree” that they understood the planning process after a full year on the RWPC. He then stated that they ought to

establish a goal for members to “strongly agree” that they understand the planning process. D. Law noted that some respondents had been RWPC members for one year, while others had only been members for six months at the time of the survey. K. Burns suggested asking on future surveys how many meetings respondents had attended. He explained that this would have an effect on their grasp of the process.

M. Cappuccilli stated that the Nominations Committee’s goals were to increase the comfort level for all new members, understanding of the process, and involvement of consumers. He went on to say that they review the survey results with these goals in mind. He then stated that their process should make new members feel strongly comfortable. C. Bogatz replied that a new member’s comfort level could also be tied to how many members they knew at the meetings. D. Law then stated that new members may have an easier time understanding the difference between priority setting and allocations in the future, as priority setting would no longer be held on an annual basis. M. Cappuccilli noted that some new members may not understand the priorities as well if the process did not occur each year.

C. Bogatz then asked why two survey respondents were not members of a committee. D. Law replied that one of these members had gotten a waiver, since he traveled to the meetings from Harrisburg. L. Diaz suggested inviting this member to the Nominations Committee, since its meetings were held immediately before the RWPC meetings.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they would like to present the actual results of the follow-up survey to the RWPC, or just a summary. The group agreed to provide a summary. K. Burns stated that it would be helpful to link the results of the survey to the action plan. He went on to say that the committee could set a goal to have 100% of respondents “strongly agree” with various questions. M. Cappuccilli stated that many new members may struggle because they did not want to look stupid by asking questions. K. Burns agreed, and went on to say that he felt that the RWPC had created a safer space for members and guests to ask questions. He stated that he also thought that the social would help to increase the comfort level of members. L. Diaz noted that she felt more comfortable following the icebreakers at the beginning of RWPC meetings. B. Morgan agreed that the icebreakers also lightened the tone of the meetings. The group then agreed to ask, “What are you most looking forward to this holiday season?” as the icebreaker at that day’s RWPC meeting. C. Bogatz added that it became easier for new members to build relationships and ask questions if they were able to get to know other members this way.

D. Law asked for other ideas to encourage members. C. Bogatz suggested providing some type of recognition for members’ birthdays. B. Morgan and N. Vidanage noted that the Positive Committee had recently begun to do this. L. Diaz stated that she was a part of a women’s group that gave birthday cards to its members, and that this made the members feel special. B. Morgan suggested putting birthday cards on the Nominations Committee’s agenda each month so they could be able to fill the cards out. K. Burns agreed, adding that this would allow the Nominations Committee members to sign the cards. D. Law noted that it would take a few months to gather birth dates from current

members. N. Vidanage then suggested sending a Google form to current members to collect updates to contact information as well as birth dates.

• **Present Action Plan to RWPC**

D. Law asked the group to review the PowerPoint presentation slides from their first presentation on the membership satisfaction survey following the meeting. She explained that the slides included overviews of the committee, the nominations process, and the scoring process. She noted that they had also included CARE Act requirements. She then stated that they included the results of the July 2010 membership satisfaction survey in the presentation, and that they could also review the process steps. She next reviewed the action steps. The group then agreed to present the action plan in the December RWPC meeting. D. Law noted that they would most likely hold a meeting for the Nominations Committee from 12 – 1 p.m. on Thursday, December 8 followed by the co-chairs meeting from 1 – 2 p.m.

C. Bogatz then asked for more information on the presentation. D. Law explained that the RWPC had conducted a membership satisfaction survey in July 2010, and that they had developed an action plan based on that survey. M. Cappuccilli suggested distributing copies of the action plan to RWPC members. D. Law noted that she would email the presentation and action plan to the committee following the meeting. M. Cappuccilli then suggested breaking the action steps into two lists for the presentation. D. Law agreed, suggesting that they have a separate slide for steps that had not yet been accomplished. B. Morgan added that they should remind the co-chairs of the RWPC to ask members to sit next to someone they did not know at each meeting.

• **Social Recruitment Event**

D. Law stated that the first informal social event would be held after that day's RWPC meeting, and that the group would also need to plan for its larger spring event. C. Bogatz asked who would sponsor the spring event. D. Law replied that they had identified two possible sponsors, and that the responsibility of planning would be rotated between the committees. She went on to say that they would be planning the event for 150 people, as they would be asking each RWPC members to bring two guests. M. Cappuccilli reminded the group that they had previously discussed holding at least one large event each year, with the possibility of additional smaller events. C. Bogatz then suggested holding an event at a non-traditional venue, such as the Mutter Museum.

M. Cappuccilli asked if there would be an ideal time to hold a large event from a recruitment standpoint. D. Law replied that they would want to hold the event before their March meeting in order to seat new applicants in the spring. C. Bogatz then volunteered to look into potential venues. D. Law noted that they would also need to consider outside catering. She also reminded the group that there had been a lot of discussion on whether to allow alcohol at the large event, and that the group had ultimately chosen to make a decision following that day's happy hour. E. Troy noted that they would need to consider that the venue would need to make a profit, and that they might prefer the group to have a cash bar available.

The group then agreed that the Nominations Committee should plan the first formal event. M. Cappuccilli suggested that they hold the event at the end of February, and the group decided to try to plan the event for February 29, 2012. N. Vidanage suggested considering the private room at Hard Rock Café as a possible venue due to its proximity to the Office. L. Diaz stated that M. Ross-Russell (OHP) had previously stated that she had found a potential sponsor for the event. D. Law agreed, and replied that she would contact the sponsor to ask for information about a budget for the event.

The group next decided to hold the event after work the work day. C. Bogatz suggested considering Maggiano's as a possible venue as well. The group then discussed holding the event from either 5:30 – 7:30 p.m. or 6:00 – 7:30 p.m. They also discussed the possibility of asking the sponsor to provide either hors d'oeuvres or a buffet. M. Cappuccilli then stated that they could announce to the RWPC that the Nominations Committee would lead the first formal event, and details would be forthcoming.

• **Next Steps**

M. Cappuccilli stated that the joint co-chairs meeting would be held on December 8. D. Law noted that they had run out of time during the follow-up orientation for the last group of new members, and asked the committee if they would like to extend the time for the next orientation. The group agreed to make the follow-up orientation ninety minutes long.

**Old Business:**

M. Cappuccilli asked when the next round of RWPC applications would be. D. Law replied that they would next score applications in March.

**New Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

**Motion:** L. Diaz moved, C. Bogatz seconded to adjourn the meeting at 1:31 p.m.

**Motion passed:** All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from September 22, 2011
- RWPC New Member Follow-Up Survey 2011 Results
- OHP Calendar

**RYAN WHITE PART A PLANNING COUNCIL (RWPC)**  
**Nominations Committee**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**Thursday, November 10, 2011 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** (*September 22, 2011*)

**Report of Co-Chairs**

**Report of Staff**

- Orientation Report Back

**Action Item**

**Discussion Items:**

- New Member Follow-up Survey Results
- Membership Retention Ideas
- Present Action Plan to RWPC
- Social Recruitment Event
- Next Steps
  - Joint Co-Chairs Meeting December 8<sup>th</sup>?
  - Follow-up Orientation January 12<sup>th</sup>?

**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, December 08, 2011. 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/calendar.html](http://www.hivphilly.org/calendar.html))*

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

Meeting Minutes of  
**Thursday, September 22, 2011  
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:** Kevin Burns, Michael Cappuccilli, Emery Troy

**Excused:** Tim Barlow, William Brawner, Lupe Diaz, William Gray

**Absent:** Alicia Beatty

**Staff:** Debbie Law, Briana Morgan, Nishika Vidanage

**Call to Order:**

K. Burns called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m., and thanked the committee co-chairs for attending.

**Approval of Agenda:**

K. Burns presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** K. Burns moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Approval of Minutes (August 11, 2011 and August 18, 2011):**

K. Burns presented the August 11, 2011 and August 18, 2011 minutes for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli moved, K. Burns seconded to approve the minutes from the August 11, 2011 meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Motion:** K. Burns moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the minutes from the August 18, 2011 meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Report of Co-Chair:**

M. Cappuccilli stated that he was a little troubled that Dafne Armstrong's reapplication for RWPC membership had not been approved. He explained that he had spoken with her, and that she had not received a dismissal letter in the mail. He went on to say that he was concerned with the process of removing current members from the RWPC. D. Law explained that D. Armstrong had contacted C. Bolden after she received a letter, and that C. Bolden had then contacted Mari Ross-Russell (OHP). She went on to say that D. Armstrong had also spoken with OHP staff, and was consequently aware that her membership would end on September 30. K. Burns noted that he had also left a voicemail message for D. Armstrong, but that he had received a return call. He added that he ought to have notified Office staff that he had not heard from her. M. Cappuccilli explained that he would have been embarrassed if he attended an allocations meeting without being sure whether he was a voting member. He then clarified that a letter had been sent to D. Armstrong regarding her membership. D. Law replied that the letter had been mailed approximately a week after the previous Nominations Committee meeting, so she would have received the letter in advance of the allocations meeting. K. Burns noted that he would have placed his phone call after the receipt of the letter. M. Cappuccilli stated that it would be important for the Nominations Committee to ensure that members that had been removed were aware of their removal. K.

Burns stated that he could call D. Armstrong again to apologize for not having a personal conversation, and M. Cappuccilli agreed that personal follow-up with thanks for participating on the Council would be appropriate. M. Cappuccilli added that they ought to remove current members in a way that was respectful as possible.

**Report of Staff:**

None.

**Discussion Items:**

• **Review RWPC Membership**

D. Law asked those present to review the membership representation by category. She explained that they had approved applications from seven applicants while they had two removals, two resignations, three members that did not reapply, and one applicant whose application was not approved. She went on to say that they currently had forty-six RWPC members, including twenty unaligned consumers. She then stated that they had the maximum number of members from both the PA Counties and New Jersey, and that they needed more African-American males from Philadelphia. She went on to say that they had a new member that was formerly incarcerated, although this member would represent another category. She continued on to say that the RWPC now had two substance abuse providers, additional Part C representation, and a representative from a state Medicaid agency. She then added that one new member had resigned before her term began.

B. Morgan then noted that almost all of the current RWPC members that had not been removed, resigned, or chosen not to reapply for membership were participating in a committee.

• **New Member Follow-up Survey**

M. Cappuccilli asked whether the new member follow-up survey should be released before or at the same time as the presentation of the action plan. He noted that they should have time to present the action plan in an upcoming RWPC meeting since they were finished with the allocations plans. K. Burns asked if they would need the full RWPC to approve the follow-up survey. D. Law replied that they would not, so K. Burns suggested sending this survey to the new members immediately and including the results with the presentation of the action plan. K. Burns then suggested that they could pass the survey to those that were present at that day's RWPC meeting, and mail it to those that were not present. D. Law then asked when the survey should be due. M. Cappuccilli and K. Burns suggested that they ask the survey to be completed by the October meeting. D. Law then stated that they would send this to approximately ten new members that had been appointed in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. M. Cappuccilli clarified that they would not ask the newest members to take the survey, since they would not have attended enough meetings. He then added that the committee co-chairs had reviewed several version of the survey to ensure that it was quick and easy enough for new members.

The group then agreed to try to present the action plan during the November RWPC meeting. D. Law noted that the group would need to review the results of the survey before presenting it to the RWPC, and that the committee would not meet in October due to the fall orientation. She went on to say that she could email the survey to those not at that day's RWPC meeting in PDF format.

• **Social Recruitment Event**

D. Law stated that the social recruitment event had been discussed at the joint co-chairs meeting. She went on to say that there had been an idea to host a big event in the spring, where they would ask each RWPC member to bring two guests. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had decided that OHP staff would coordinate the first social. D. Law agreed, and explained that they had found a pharmaceutical company that had agreed to sponsor a large social. She noted that the Nominations Committee would need to discuss this before the joint co-chairs meeting. M. Cappuccilli added that they had talked about holding this event around Valentine's Day.

D. Law then stated that they had also heard that members would like to have a small meet and greet for RWPC members to get to know one another, noting that the OHP could print reminders for this event. She went on to say that they could have a small event in the short-term, followed by a larger event in the spring. K. Burns clarified that the event in the spring would be geared toward recruitment of new members. D. Law replied that this would be both a social and a recruitment event. K. Burns clarified that the spring event would be an opportunity for members to bring guests that they thought would be good for the RWPC, while the first event would be more social. D. Law explained that there had previously been some discussion around whether to include alcohol in these events, but that they could choose to have an informal happy hour after an RWPC meeting. M. Cappuccilli clarified that this could be an unofficial happy hour, as opposed to the official event in the spring. The group then agreed to hold the informal event following the November 10 RWPC meeting. M. Cappuccilli stated that they should make this a casual event, while the event in the spring could be bigger.

K. Burns then asked if there would be some RWPC members in recovery that could not participate if they held the happy hour in a bar. E. Troy replied that these members could attend and just choose not to drink. B. Morgan noted that planning an event to exclude alcohol would alienate those that would otherwise choose to attend a happy hour after work. E. Troy agreed, and explained that people in recovery needed to learn to be around these types of situations. K. Burns then suggested holding the event in a restaurant or bar and asking members to be responsible. He also suggested considering the Marriot as a venue. B. Morgan suggested looking at Tazia, which would be able to set up drink specials for the group. D. Law noted that Tazia was located at 11<sup>th</sup> and Arch Streets, and that they had a private room available. The group then agreed to announce the happy in October, and to work on a reminder card to be used at the October meeting.

D. Law then stated that the group could plan its big event for approximately 150 people, and that they would hope to have this event near the OHP. She noted that the Asian Arts Initiative gallery would be an option for a venue, and that they did not serve alcohol. N. Vidanage suggested Loew's as another option. K. Burns and M. Cappuccilli then asked why they could not have alcohol at the event. D. Law explained that people had previously been concerned about issues for those in recovery. N. Vidanage suggested providing non-alcoholic drinks during the event and a cash bar afterwards. M. Cappuccilli replied that he thought that E. Troy was correct, and that they should simply expect members to be responsible. E. Troy stated that an alcohol-free event would be unfair for people that drink. He added that he frequently conducts events at which alcohol is available. M. Cappuccilli

asked if he had experienced any problems at these events. E. Troy replied that he had not, and that those that wanted to drink would find a way to drink. He explained that they could not force people to behave, and that they needed to allow people to be responsible. M. Cappuccilli then agreed with this statement. D. Law then stated that the group could evaluate its policy after the first event.

M. Cappuccilli next stated that the spring event would be a recruiting event, and that it should not be a problem to serve alcohol since the event was not sponsored by the Office. He went on to suggest looking for a space with a bar. E. Troy suggested looking for a venue that had an area with a bar and an area without a bar, which would allow attendees to choose where they would like to be. K. Burns then suggested the penthouse at the Four Points as a possible venue. D. Law asked if K. Burns had conducted an event at the Four Points. K. Burns agreed, noting that the penthouse held approximately two hundred people. E. Troy added that the Field House was nice as well, and K. Burns agreed.

• **Next Steps**

K. Burns noted that orientation for new members would be held from 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. on October 13. D. Law added that current RWPC members were welcome to attend to meet the new members. K. Burns suggested announcing this at that day's RWPC meeting.

D. Law then asked the group how they would like to assign mentors to the six new members. K. Burns suggested asking RWPC members if they would like to volunteer as buddies, and request that they contact D. Law if they were interested. M. Cappuccilli noted that they had asked the committee co-chairs to serve as mentors for the last group of new members.

**Old Business:**

None.

**New Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from August 11, 2011
- Meeting Minutes from August 18, 2011
- Planning Council Representation: Membership by Category
- RWPC New Member Follow-Up Survey
- OHP Calendar

## RWPC New Member Follow-Up Survey 2011

1. At my first RWPC meeting, I felt: *(please circle one)*

Very comfortable 2 (25%)	Comfortable 4 (50%)	Not sure	Somewhat comfortable 2 (25%)	Not comfortable at all
-----------------------------	------------------------	----------	---------------------------------	------------------------

2. At my last recent RWPC meeting, I felt: *(please circle one)*

Very comfortable 7 (88%)	Comfortable 1 (12%)	Not sure	Somewhat comfortable	Not comfortable at all
-----------------------------	------------------------	----------	----------------------	------------------------

3. I felt comfortable with the information given to me at my last RWPC meeting. *(please circle one)*

Strongly agree 3 (38%)	Agree 5 (62%)	Do not know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
---------------------------	------------------	-------------	----------	-------------------

4. The RWPC meetings are facilitated by the co-chairs in a way that allows open discussions. *(please circle one)*

Strongly agree 4 (50%)	Agree 4 (50%)	Do not know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
---------------------------	------------------	-------------	----------	-------------------

5. If I had a question, I would feel comfortable asking other RWPC members for assistance. *(please circle one)*

Strongly agree 3 (38%)	Agree 5 (62%)	Do not know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
---------------------------	------------------	-------------	----------	-------------------

6. My understanding of the overall role of the RWPC has been: *(please circle one)*

Very clear 2 (25%)	Clear (62%)	Do not know	Somewhat clear 1 (12%)	Not clear at all
-----------------------	----------------	-------------	---------------------------	------------------

7. My role as a member of the RWPC has been: *(please circle one)*

Very clear 3 (38%)	Clear 4 (50%)	Do not know	Somewhat clear 1 (12%)	Not clear at all
-----------------------	------------------	-------------	---------------------------	------------------

8. To make informed decisions, I have: *(please circle one)*

More than adequate information	Adequate information 7	Not sure	Somewhat adequate information 1 (12%)	Not enough information at all
--------------------------------	---------------------------	----------	--	-------------------------------

9. I feel that I understand the planning process: *(please circle one)*

Strongly agree  
1 (12%)

Agree  
6 (75%)

Do not know  
1 (12%)

Disagree

Strongly disagree

10. If you are a PLWHA, do you feel your voice is being heard? *(please circle one)*

Yes=3 (38%)

No

Not applicable =5 (62%)

11. In your opinion, does the RWPC address the needs of PLWHA? *(please circle one)*

Yes =8 (100%)

No

12. Which committee(s) have you joined: *(please circle all that apply)*

Comp Planning

Finance

Needs Assessment =4

Nominations =1

Positive =3

None =2

13. What, if any, changes could be made to improve the way that the RWPC functions?

- Make the calendars for the next 2 months instead of current and next
- Better orientation of new members w/ timeline of planning process
- Advertise more to the NJ community
- Send out agenda ahead of time
- The staff performs an excellent job in administering the council meetings. It's hard to see any room for improvement.

14. What have you found confusing or hard to understand at RWPC meetings?

- nothing, everything is explained very well
- terminology and overview of planning process w/ timeline of sequence of events in planning process
- funding of last resort, what other resources are there?
- Allocations vs priority setting

15. What has made you retain your RWPC membership (stay on the Planning Council)?

- The difference we can make for HIV patients in care and other service they can obtain
- The education that I am given x2
- Great people (network), great training and I feel I can have a possible impact
- Learning more and wanting to be an asset
- Willingness to learn and to help others
- Relationships, information learned, knowledge of funding process, learning about strengths/needs of the HIV community
- My work association along with a desire to provide input in the bigger picture of helping those who need care.

16. Please provide any additional comments or suggestion regarding your experience as a RWPC member

- My experience has been very enjoyable and education about what the RWPC does for PLWH
- The members are friendly
- Have senior members mentor new members was great. This survey and the new members orientation, check-in was also great
- It's clear you want to make the on-boarding process smoother.
- I am wondering about being on the RWPC and if I should get a full-time job how should I handle that?
- I appreciate how hard the office works!
- The challenge of informing members who help to make these big decisions in such a short window of time is tremendous and has been done very well at the RWPC.