

**Ryan White Part A Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia EMA
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 9, 2009
2 p.m. - 4 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning 340 N. 12th St., Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Dafne Armstrong, Henry Bennett, Carmell Bolden, Kevin Burns, Michael Cappuccilli, Ramona Christian, John Churchville, Christopher Coleman, Karen Coleman, Ronda Goldfein, Raymond Hayward, Gerry Keys, Richard Lampkins (Co-Chair), Antoinette Mapp, Miguel Matos, Tom McCoy (Co-Chair), Tyrone McCray, Michael Myers, Harry Pack, Eric Paulukonis, Ann Ricksecker, Sandra Thompson, Emery Troy, Lorrita Wellington, Melvin White, Jacqueline Whitfield, Belinda Williams

Excused: Christine Ambrose, Maryann Andrews, Jose Benitez, William Brawner, Alan Edelstein, Peter Houle, Emmanuel Koku, Kate Kozeniewski, Mark Pletcher, Nurit Shein, Ronald Sy

Absent: Alicia Beatty, Gary Bell, Jacinto Grant, Stefan Hobbs, Tiguida Kaba, Waleska Maldonado, Carlos Morales, Roberta McLean, Joseph Roderick, James Sylvester Smith, Robert Thomas, Alameen Wallace

Guests: Chris Chu (AACO), Rick Colon (AACO), Danielle Davis (Gilead Sciences), Terry Davis (Tibotec Therapeutics), Arthur Dion (ACSNJ), Ronald Lassiter, Dolores Macrina (AACO), Joseph Malloy, Marianne Marezzi, Andrew McCarthy (Tibotec Therapeutics), Joe Muford, Norah Salmon (ACSNJ), Tye Underdue

Staff: Monica Getahun, Nicole Johns, Michael Milsop, Briana Morgan, Mari Ross-Russell

Call to Order/Moment of Silence/Introductions:

R. Lampkins called the meeting to order at 2:11 p.m. A moment of silence and introductions of those present followed.

Approval of Agenda:

R. Lampkins presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** J. Churchville moved, G. Keys seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes:

R. Lampkins presented the March 12, 2009 minutes for approval. T. McCray stated that he had been excused for the previous month. **Motion:** M. White moved, C. Morales seconded to approve the minutes from the March 2009 meeting as amended. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Public Comment:

J. Malloy stated that he hoped that those present would make a statement in regard to what had been stated by the Pope. He went on to say that he had attended a Liberty City Political Forum, and in two consecutive meetings, there was not one question asked regarding HIV/AIDS. He stated that there were two executive directors of ASO there, one of which was involved in the Planning Council. He added that he was disturbed that the mayor would be delivering an award to Dwight Evans when he had not mentioned anything about the HIV rates in Philadelphia. He then stated that the group ought to start canvassing the city to let community members know what the Ryan White Planning Council does, and that more data needed to be released to make it clear that the epidemic was far from being over. He concluded that they had the advantage of being aware of the data and that they ought to share it with others.

R. Lampkins asked for more information about the Pope's remarks. J. Malloy replied that the Pope had stated that condoms kill, and that HIV/AIDS ought to be dealt with spiritually. He concluded that a statement in regard to these comments ought to be made. R. Lampkins thanked J. Malloy for his comments.

Report of Co-Chairs:

R. Lampkins reported that he had attended the CAEAR Coalition's Advocacy Days on Capitol Hill. He stated that the new director of the Program for National AIDS Policy had been there, and that Kevin Burns and Nurit Shein had also attended the Council Membership meeting. He went on to say that the new director had said that this was an exciting time as the new administration takes a look at health care reform, and that he encourages the present providers to participate as Crawley's office reaches out to communities. He explained that this would be a great opportunity to share their work, and that Washington D.C. is looking to hear from them. He noted that the stimulus package does have a health and wellness component in it, and that the CAEAR Coalition had specifically asked for \$2.8 billion for Ryan White and \$610 million for MAI, which would be a \$200 million increase for MAI. K. Burns added that R. Lampkins, Pat Bass, and he did 11 visits, and that the visits had been encouraging. He noted that all but one said they would sign on to the extension letter and the funding letter.

T. McCoy welcomed the new members to the Planning Council. He told everyone present to feel free to ask questions during the meeting.

Report of Staff:

N. Johns stated that the Planning Council members would receive a short survey within the next few weeks in regard to available trainings, and asked them all to participate.

Discussion Item:

- **Priority Setting Tool**

A. Ricksecker stated that the Comprehensive Planning Committee had met the previous day to work on their new factors and priority setting process. She explained that she had heard that members wanted more clarification on the new tool, and that today they would go through a process unrelated to HIV so they could apply the concept of weights in decision-making. She went on to say that the committee would

be bringing the recommended factors and their draft weights in May, while their June meeting would be the committee's annual joint meeting with Needs Assessment. She explained that the Comprehensive Planning Committee has the responsibility of hosting the discussion on Priority Setting, and that they also create an update to the Comprehensive Plan each year.

M. Milsop explained that the example they would be reviewing came from prevention, and that it would be a very simple exercise (*see – attached handout*). He went on to say that some factors would be data-based as opposed to value-based, while some combine both. N. Johns next explained the importance of understanding weights, noting that the most heavily-weighted factor would be the most important one. She explained that, as they had determined the weights and factors as a group, this would result in a situation that everyone was okay with. K. Coleman asked if there had been an error on a slide, and N. Johns agreed. N. Johns noted that Slide #10 had the wrong weight for location.

M. Milsop continued on by evaluating the results, and the committee's draft list of potential factors. He noted that core services would receive additional points because of the weight that HRSA gives them for funding.

A. Ricksecker explained that the committee would draft proposed weights, and bring those back to the May Planning Council meeting.

Points of Integration Update:

M. Milsop stated that the group was discussing creating a comprehensive information packet, and that A. Ricksecker was reporting back on integration and making sure that HIV tests were available at any step along the way for STD. H. Pack asked what Points of Integration was for the benefit of new members. M. Milsop replied that this was a committee working on the integration of care and prevention.

Report of Committees:

- ***Finance Committee – Alan Edelstein, Co-Chair***
No report.

- ***Needs Assessment Committee – Gerry Keys, Co-Chair***

G. Keys stated that the committee had not met yet, and that their meeting date had been changed to Monday, April 20 from 2 – 4 p.m.

- ***Comprehensive Planning Committee – Ann Ricksecker, Co-Chair***

A. Ricksecker stated that the committee had had a presentation from the grantee on utilization, quality management, and WICY data. She noted that they had seen an increase in utilization for case management and medications with a decrease in substance abuse and DEFA. She went on to say that the data showed that the funding was providing services that mirrored the epidemic, and that they had not pulled out any populations that were underserved. She added that the committee had also heard about quality management and learned that there were some brand new indicators.

- ***Positive Committee – Melvin White, Co-Chair***

M. White stated that they had been doing town halls and consumer feedback groups, and that they had heard wonderful feedback. He noted that they had been inviting people to attend Positive Committee meetings, and asked anyone with a submission for their newsletter to get it to the Office as soon as possible. He added that they would also be discussing the possibility of a name change, and that they had recently learned a great deal about needs assessments. He invited those present to attend their next meeting on Monday, April 13 at 12 p.m.

- ***Nominations Committee – Kevin Burns, Co-Chair***

K. Burns stated that N. Johns had done an overview of their open nominations process, and that they had brainstormed ways to make the application more accessible. He stated that they would be emailing suggestions into the Office for discussion over the next year. He went on to say that the Planning Council was at its maximum for membership, so they had discussed the possibility of creating a waiting list. He noted that attendance had been an issue, so the waiting list would give them an opportunity to see people's commitment to attending subcommittee meetings. He added that they had also discussed the letters that they would send after the review of various applications. He concluded that it had been a productive meeting, and that they had discussed a tentative date in June for the Office of HIV Planning to do an open house on behalf of the RWPC and CPG.

- ***Policy and Procedures Committee – Tyrone McCray, Chair***

T. McCray welcomed new members to attend the committee meetings in the future, though the group did not meet regularly.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

R. Goldfein stated that Philadelphia County would be electing a new district attorney for the first time in approximately fifteen years. She explained that they had seen repeated incidents of consenting adults with HIV being charged with serious crimes for having unprotected or protected sex. She concluded they should all ask these candidates how they feel about this issue in public forums.

M. Cappuccilli stated that he was looking at the minutes from the previous month, which stated that the regional funding was split based on PLWA cases, but that this could change to include HIV cases as well in the future. M. Ross-Russell replied that they wanted to make sure that the numbers were accurate, up-to-date, and accepted by the CDC before any changes were made. She stated that any changes in the future would be brought before the entire Planning Council. M. Cappuccilli asked for a timetable. M.

Ross-Russell replied that Dr. Brady would be at the full Planning Council meeting in the next month, and that she would be able to answer questions about the surveillance data.

Adjournment:

Motion: T. McCray moved, M. White seconded to adjourn the meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts Distributed at the Meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from March 12, 2009
- Key Steps to Priority Setting Slides
- OHP Calendar

Philadelphia EMA Ryan White Part A Planning Council

Thursday, April 9, 2009 2:00-4:00 pm

Call to Order/ Moment of Silence

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes *(from 12 March 2009)*:

Public Comment

Report of Co-Chairs

Report of Staff

Discussion Item:

- Priority Setting Tool

Points of Integration Update

Report of Committees

- Finance Committee – Alan Edelstein, Co-Chair
- Needs Assessment Committee—Gerry Keys, Co-Chair
- Comprehensive Planning Committee—Karen Coleman, Co-Chair
- Positive Committee—Melvin White, Co-Chair
- Nominations Committee—Kevin Burns, Co-Chair
- Policy and Procedures Committee—Tyrone McCray, Chair

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

PLEASE TURN ALL CELLPHONES AND PAGERS TO SILENT OR VIBRATE.

The next meeting of the Planning Council will be Thursday, May 14, 2009 from 2-4pm 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). If you require any special assistance, please contact the office at least 5 days in advance.

**Ryan White Part A Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia EMA
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 12, 2009
2 p.m. - 4 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning 340 N. 12th St., Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

Present: Christine Ambrose, Maryann Andrews, Dafne Armstrong, Alicia Beatty, Jose Benitez, Henry Bennett, Carmell Bolden, William Brawner, Ramona Christian, Karen Coleman, Alan Edelstein, Raymond Hayward, Peter Houle, Tiguida Kaba, Gerry Keys, Kate Kozeniewski, Richard Lampkins (Co-Chair), Waleska Maldonado, Miguel Matos, Carlos Morales, Thomas McCoy (Co-Chair), Michael Myers, Harry Pack, Nurit Shein, Tara Stancil, Ronald Sy, Sandra Thompson, Lorrita Wellington, Melvin White, Belinda Williams

Excused: Gary Bell, Kevin Burns, Michael Cappuccilli, Christopher Coleman, Jacinto Grant, Mark Pletcher, Ann Ricksecker

Absent: Tamara Brickham, John Churchville, Stefan Hobbs, Betty Jane Leon, Brenda Shelton-Dunston, James Sylvester Smith, Arnetta Sojourner, Robert Thomas, Emery Troy, Alameen Wallace, Ann Williams

Guests: Craig T. Ashley, Jane Baker (AACO), Lionell Bell, Chris Chu (AACO), Rick Colon (AACO), Emmanuel Koku, Brian Langley, Ronald Lassiter, Dolores Macrina (AACO), Joseph Malloy, Antoinette Mapp, Joe Minford, Gail Thomas, Jacqueline Whitfield, Susan B. Wyche (DHHS)

Staff: Monica Getahun, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Michael Milsop, Briana Morgan, Mari Ross-Russell

Call to Order/Moment of Silence/Introductions:

R. Lampkins called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. A moment of silence and introductions of those present followed.

Approval of Agenda:

R. Lampkins presented the agenda for approval. **Motion: M. White moved, T. Stancil seconded to approve the agenda. Motion passed: All in favor.**

Approval of Minutes:

R. Lampkins presented the February 12, 2009 minutes for approval. **Motion: M. White moved, C. Morales seconded to approve the minutes from the February 2009 meeting. Motion passed: All in favor.**

Public Comment:

None.

Report of Co-Chairs:

R. Lampkins stated that the 2009 Omnibus Bill had been signed, which included an increase for domestic HIV programs. He stated that interested parties could go to Thomas.loc.gov and do a search for HR1105 to find the 111th Congress bill information.

Report of Staff:

N. Johns stated that CD-ROMs containing the Comprehensive Plans and epidemiological profile were available in the conference room.

D. Law stated that the Nominations Committee had recommended eight new people for membership and though the new members had had orientation that morning, they would officially be on the Planning Council in April. R. Lampkins welcomed the new members to the Council.

Training:

N. Johns stated that she would be reviewing the basics on how to review and use data (*see – attached slides*). She suggested various ways to make comprehension of data easier, including looking at information piece by piece and asking questions. She went on to review the basics of reading charts and tables, pausing to review a particular table with the group. She pointed out two types of data that the group would use for community planning – the epidemiological profile and needs assessments. She continued by going more in-depth on the various information included in the epidemiological profile as well as the information found through needs assessments. She then reviewed the purpose and purview of the various types of needs assessments, including surveys, focus groups, and town halls. She explained the methodology, limitations, and qualitative results included in documentation for needs assessments before reviewing how to use planning documents.

Action Items:

- **Allocations – Finance Committee**

A. Edelstein directed those present to the partial allocations spreadsheets (*see – attached handout*). He stated that the fiscal year for the Ryan White CARE Act runs from March 1 – February 28, but that the Omnibus Budget Bill had just passed. He explained that this bill had granted an increase to Ryan White, but that it had passed too late to be included in the initial budget for the year. He stated that they had to come up with an allocations plan based on the dollars that had been included in the Continuing Resolution. He went on to say that AACO had been notified that they would be receiving an initial reward of 54% of what they had received for their formula award the previous year. He noted that those that had been involved in the process two years prior would have an understanding of what they had ahead.

A. Edelstein went on to explain that the Finance Committee, in consultation with AACO, had developed a plan. He pointed out that they were hoping for, at minimum, level funding. With this in mind, they decided to accept a plan for allocations that represented 54% of the level-funding plan that they had developed the previous summer. He also reminded those present that funding was allocated between the three regions of the EMA based on the number of living AIDS cases in each region, so Philadelphia would receive 77.36% of funding, the PA Counties would receive 13.07% of funding, and Southern New Jersey would receive 8.57% of funding. **Motion: The Finance Committee moved to accept the allocations plan based on the level-funding allocations plan as adapted to a budget for 54% of the formula award.**

Discussion on the motion:

J. Baker stated that it was very important to get the awards out, because providers' expenditures had not stopped. A. Beatty asked how long the 54% of the formula was meant to last. J. Baker replied that AACO had historically received their supplemental awards on May 28. A. Edelstein added that they might find out about the remainder of the formula award before May 28.

C. Ambrose asked if this was 54% of the first column on the spreadsheet, since the numbers did not match up. M. Ross-Russell replied that the second column represented 54% of the formula award, while the first column included both the previous year's formula and supplemental awards. M. White asked for more information on when MAI would be disbursed. J. Baker replied that MAI awards would come in August, and that they would fund primary care, case management, and outreach services.

M. Matos asked if they would have another award coming on May 28. A. Edelstein replied that they were not sure, but that they anticipated that another award would come on May 28 as it had two years prior. He explained that they would actually receive two more awards: the remainder of the formula award and then the supplemental award.

M. Matos asked why they had such a short notice to discuss the allocations. J. Baker and A. Edelstein explained that they passed the information on to the Planning Council as soon as they had it, and that it had come down from the federal government. P. Houle explained the difference between formula, supplemental, and MAI awards. He stated that they were getting a portion of just the formula dollars. A. Edelstein explained that the formula award was based on the epidemic in each EMA and TGA, while the supplemental award was competitive.

C. Bolden asked if the funding was split between regions based on living AIDS cases or HIV/AIDS cases. A. Edelstein replied that the Planning Council had made the decision several years ago to base the funding split on living AIDS cases, but that they could change this to include HIV cases as well in the future.

Motion passed: 22 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Discussion Items:

- **Priority Setting Tool – Comprehensive Planning Committee**

M. Milsop stated that he would be reviewing the Priority Setting process at the request of the Comprehensive Planning Committee (*see – attached slides*). He reviewed the various roles and parts involved in the entire process. He explained that the Comprehensive Planning Committee develops recommendations, leads a Priority Setting exercise for the public, and then presents the priorities for a full vote from the Planning Council. He stated that K. Coleman would next be reviewing the new priority setting tool.

J. Malloy asked M. Milsop to explain succinctly why the epidemiological profile was distributed by CD-ROM rather than in printed form. M. Milsop replied that this had been a cost issue, and that there had always been excess copies in years past that no one wanted. J. Malloy replied that this created difficulties for people that do not have computer access. M. Ross-Russell stated that the Office makes sure that the document is available on CD-ROM. She explained that the epidemiological profile is a 500-page

document, and that to print a great deal of copies that are not utilized is a waste of funding. She noted that the documents were available as they were approved on the website, and that paper copies of the epidemiological profile were available on request. J. Malloy replied that community members that were not aware of this availability would think that the epidemiological profile did not exist any longer. R. Lampkins called upon the providers in the room to let their clients know that CD-ROMs containing the epidemiological profile and other planning documents were available, and that paper copies would be made available upon request.

K. Coleman stated that she and A. Ricksecker had seen a new priority setting model at an All Titles meeting that they had brought back to the Comprehensive Planning Committee. She went on to say that the group would be talking about it over several meetings, and asked everyone present to be flexible when it comes to change. She explained that they would have to give this new tool a chance to see if it is something that works for Philadelphia. She directed those present to a handout on weighted factors (*see – attached handouts*). She explained that the factors have already been in play in their priority setting decisions, including payer of last resort, service utilization, consumer priority, access to and/or maintenance in care, specific gaps/emerging needs, and core services. She went on to say that the scales had not yet been developed, and that this would affect the scores. She added that they had also been considering an “other” category to address issues not included in other factors.

A. Edelstein stated that the choice of factors was excellent, but that he did not understand scale or scoring the factors. K. Coleman explained that her personal scores might look different from other Planning Council members’ scores. C. Ambrose explained that they would weigh the factors, and that the weight for the factors would come into play for Priority Setting. She noted that the factors had been used in every Priority Setting in the past.

N. Shein asked what the process would be if members thought that there were missing factors. K. Coleman requested that anyone with something to add attend the next Comprehensive Planning meeting to give their input. M. Milsop explained that the current factors had been addressed any time the committee reviewed a service category. A. Beatty stated that this was an excellent document, but that HRSA was pressing everyone to look at the payer of last resort, and that she was sorry she had missed the initial conversations on this tool. M. Matos stated that they were trying to make the process for each category uniform, and that he thought that the clients ought to make the decision. M. Milsop replied that they receive consumer input through various needs assessments. C. Ambrose clarified that consumers that use the services would be voting on the priorities, and N. Shein clarified that there would be a consumer priority tool. M. Matos stated that he was envisioning a process with consumer input. The group explained that this is accomplished through the town halls and consumer feedback groups conducted each year.

T. Stancil stated that, as a consumer, she thought that this would be a great tool. N. Shein questioned how they would determine the limitations for the tool. K. Coleman agreed that the committee was aware that there would be limitations, and that they were hoping to bring the rest of the information to the RWPC meeting in April. C. Ambrose added that any big shifts in priorities would have to be justified, and that they could not make

random moves for service categories. J. Baker added that they would still have the split of at least 75% of funding in core services no matter how they arrived at their decisions.

Points of Integration Update:

N. Shein stated that the Points of Integration Workgroup would meet on Tuesday, March 17 from 10 a.m. – 12 p.m. and welcomed all those present to attend.

Report of Committees:

- **Finance Committee – Alan Edelstein, Co-Chair**

A. Edelstein stated that the committee's meetings were held on the first Thursday of the month at 2 p.m. and encouraged new members to participate.

- **Needs Assessment Committee – Christine Ambrose, Co-Chair**

C. Ambrose thanked the new members for participating, and asked them to attend the Needs Assessment Committee meetings on the second Monday of the month from 2 p.m. – 4 p.m. She noted that the town hall meetings had begun earlier in the week, and directed those present to check their calendars for dates, locations, and times (*see – attached calendar*). She added that the committee was currently in the process of reviewing a survey to be used at a youth-specific town hall. R. Hayward noted that the Philadelphia town hall had had low attendance, and encouraged providers to convey information on town halls to their clients. M. Matos replied that there are many variables that can determine whether or not a client attends a meeting, and that this was an important consideration.

- **Comprehensive Planning Committee – Karen Coleman, Co-Chair**

K. Coleman noted that there would be a meeting date and time change only for the month of April, and that Comprehensive Planning would be meeting on Wednesday, April 8 from 3 p.m. – 5 p.m.

- **Positive Committee – Melvin White, Co-Chair**

M. White encouraged those present to spread the word about the Positive Committee. He noted that the Philadelphia town hall and DEFA educational summit had been poorly attended, and asked everyone to inform consumers about events in the future.

- **Nominations Committee – Debbie Law, Staff**

D. Law stated that the Nominations Committee had agreed to lengthen the orientation process, and that they had put eight current members that were reapplying back on the Planning Council, as well as one former member. She went on to review the attendance policy for those present. She explained that they currently had the maximum number of allowable members on the Planning Council, and that they would be looking at stricter enforcement of the attendance policy in the future.

- **Policy and Procedures Committee – Tyrone McCray, Chair**

No report.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

S. Thompson stated that St. Mary's Family Respite Center would be closing its doors on March 31.

A. Edelstein stated that changes were taking place at AACO, and that they wanted to express their appreciation to Jane Baker as the new director of AACO, as well as to John Cella, who was retiring. He went on to say that they wanted to recognize the support, encouragement, hard work, and other assistance they had received from J. Baker. He noted that R. Colon would be moving into J. Baker's former position. J. Baker thanked everyone for the learning experience, including staff, Planning Council members, and all of the consumers.

T. McCoy stated that he was very upset to hear that St. Mary's Family Respite Center was closing as a consumer. He went on to say that it was so important to champion for supportive services for women living with HIV/AIDS, particularly women with children.

Adjournment:

Motion: M. Myers moved, M. White seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed: All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts Distributed at the Meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from February 12, 2009
- Understand & Using Data Slides
- Allocations Spreadsheets (4)
- Priority Setting Slides
- Assigning Weight to Factors for Priority Setting
- OHP Calendar

Key Steps to Priority Setting

You and four friends are planning to meet for dinner, so the group must choose a restaurant everyone will like. To do that, you will use the same concepts — factors, weighting, rating, and scoring — your Comprehensive Planning Committee uses in priority setting for HIV community planning.

To ease and speed the choice of restaurants, you and your friends should identify the factors that are most important to everyone.

Once you've done that, you can begin to suggest restaurants. It's important to agree as a group which factors to consider. Otherwise, each person may base the decision on personal preferences, and it will become impossible to select a restaurant everyone likes.

Understanding Factors

- How much will the meal cost?
- What kind of food does the restaurant serve?
- What is the restaurant's atmosphere?
- Where is the restaurant located?

FACT-BASED VERSUS VALUE-BASED DECISION MAKING

Some factors are based primarily on facts.

Where is the restaurant located?

Others are based primarily on values

Do I like the food?

Most factors combine elements of both facts and values. For example, considering price requires both

facts
Do I have enough money with me to pay for the meal?

and values

Is the meal worth the price?

- HRSA expects priority setting to reflect both fact-based data, such as the epidemiologic profile, and more value-based considerations, such as consumer preferences or priorities.
- The Planning Council should make its consideration of both fact- and value-based factors as explicit as possible. Additionally, you may want to:
- Consider some factors based strictly on values. For example, when recommending priorities, incorporating service utilization data.
- Consider nonquantifiable data such as Unmet Need

Understanding Weights

Once your friends have decided which factors to consider in choosing a restaurant, you need to determine the relative importance — or weight — of each factor. For example, if all agree that cost carries the most weight, it becomes your main factor for choosing a restaurant.

Factors & Weights that your friends agreed to.

Factor	Weight
Cost	5
Location	2
Type of Food	4
Atmosphere	3

Understanding Rating

Friend #1 rated 2 Restaurants

Factor	Tres Chic Rating	Pizzeria Rating
Cost	1	5
Location	3	2
Type of Food	4	3
Atmosphere	2	4

Understanding Scoring

Friend #1 Score for Tres Chic

Factor	Weight	Tres Chic	Score (weight x rate)
Cost	5	1	5
Location	3	2	6
Type of Food	4	4	16
Final Tres Chic Score			30

Compare Tres Chic to Pizzeria

Friend # 1 score for Pizzeria

Factor	Weight	Pizzeria	Score (weight x rate)
Cost	5	5	25
Location	2	2	4
Type of Food	4	3	12
Atmosphere	3	2	6
Final Pizzeria Score			47

Restaurant Pizzeria wins big. Your friend prefers the inexpensive and laid-back atmosphere of Restaurant Pizzeria to the costly and uncomfortable Restaurant Tres Chic. Others may or may not agree. To find out and choose the restaurant the group prefers, add the scores for each restaurant. The top score wins.

Evaluating the Results

Every decision-making process has strengths and limitations. After you complete a group decision making process, review the results as a group and make sure that they are acceptable to everyone. It's also important to record the group's suggestions for improving the process next time.

Comprehensive Committee's Draft list of Factors

The Committee adopted the factors below based on the questions asked and data reviewed in the past year.

- Payer of Last Resort
- Service Utilization
- Consumer Priority
- Access to&/or Maintenance in Care
- Specific Gaps/Emerging Needs
- Core Services