

# MEETING AGENDA

*Thursday, August 15, 2019*

*12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.*

Call to Order

Welcome/Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Report of Staff

Discussion Items:

- Policies and Procedures Regarding Research
- Remote Meeting Participation
- Meeting Times
- Code of Conduct

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

**Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.**

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12<sup>TH</sup> Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • [www.hivphilly.org](http://www.hivphilly.org)



**HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Executive Committee  
Thursday, May 22, 2019  
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

**Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107**

**Present:** Keith Carter, Lupe Diaz, Alan Edelstein, Sharee Heaven, Clint Steib.

**Absent:** Loretta Matus, Jeanette Murdock, Sam Romero.

**Excused:** Michael Cappuccilli, David Gana.

**Call to order**

C. Steib called the meeting to order at 2:10pm.

**Welcome/Introductions**

No introductions were given. C. Steib agreed to chair the meeting.

**Approval of Agenda**

C. Steib asked for approval of the agenda. Motion: L. Diaz moved, K. Carter seconded to approve the meeting agenda. Motion passed: all in favor.

**Approval of Minutes**

C. Steib asked for approval of the February 7, 2019 Executive Committee meeting minutes. Motion: A. Edelstein moved, K. Carter seconded to approve the meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed: all in favor.

**Report of Staff**

M. Ross Russell reported that the Brown Bag series of programs starts tomorrow which will be about the living history of the HIV epidemic in Philadelphia. The conversation will be talking about the local epidemic compared to the national epidemic over time with special guests.

N. Johns reported that there was limited participation at the Listening Session in Bucks County and she would be visiting a support group there later in May. She noted that it was reported that there could be weeks delays for newly diagnosed people to receive their HIV medications because providers were waiting for the results of the genotype testing. C. Steib noted that there was need for some clinical education by the AETC for providers. K. Carter noted that another false belief was that people need to have medical case management to access RW services. N. Johns noted that that information was corrected and the providers noted that some of those refusing case management were PLWH with high income.

## Discussion Items:

### Policies and Procedures Regarding Research

M. Ross-Russell explained that OHP has been connected by researchers to participate in their studies in over the years and there was an increase recently. She noted that she generally has declined participation because of the lack of adequate information or applicability to the HIPC. She said that sometimes the requests seemed to be pro forma. She elaborated recently OHP was approached by UPENN to work on one of their projects about community engagement around PrEP related to the development of an End the Epidemic process/plan. She elaborated that the NIH and some of the federal grantors are coming out with funding opportunities with 2-3 week turn around time. This request required a letter of support, or participation from HIPC as the advisory board. The reason for the request given was that the HIPC members were connections to the community and knew the community. It would have required having a couple presentations from the researchers and giving feedback on tools, etc. She noted the challenge was the short turnaround time and the lack of protocols for the HIPC to make these kinds of decisions. The contact was after the April HIPC meeting and the deadline for letter of support was April 30<sup>th</sup>, well before the May HIPC meeting. She added the suggestion is to use this conversation to develop protocols and guidelines for research participation and/or support.

A. Edelstein noted that governance boards have a procedure to have some designated group of people authorized to make a decision in these types of cases, and then that would be presented to the board at a later date. He noted that it might be something worth doing, to have HIPC chairs or Executive Committee fill that role. He noted that his former organization had a formal policy around research, and there are many good policies out there to be used as a starting point. He agreed that having a set process in place allows the council to be able to respond quickly in the future. M. Ross Russell noted that this had not come up before because the previous requests were not necessarily beneficial to HIPC or the planning process. She explained that the recent request might have been a way to bring in new people to the process and develop knowledge and understanding of HIPC members. She cautioned that whatever projects the HIPC agrees to participate in has to fit in with the purpose and function of the HIPC. B. Morgan noted that the bylaws forbid the cochairs from speaking on behalf of the HIPC without support of the council. M. Ross Russell noted that the planning bodies have historically required anyone seeking a letter of support to have the project presented to the body and for the body to make a decision about their participation. She expounded that the former HIV Planning Group (prevention) required those requesting support to participate on the HPG, and people didn't show up and participate.

The group discussed various times when urgent matters came up for the council.

A. Edelstein asked if the bylaws allow for voting by electronic means or by telephone. B. Morgan explained that votes do not count if you are not physically present. A. Edelstein noted that limiting voting to being physically present hamstringing the HIPC. M. Ross Russell agreed and added that the protocol would have to be written to allow for that to happen. A. Edelstein asked if this could be open to any urgent need, not just research participation. M. Ross Russell said that what kinds of projects, letters of support, etc. could be clarified in protocols but it could be one protocol. Those decisions have to fit into the time, resources, and responsibilities of the HIPC. She added that preference can be given to local projects. A. Edelstein said that forming relationships with organizations can benefit the HIPC for other reasons.

B. Morgan noted that this may not require a change of the bylaws but a detailed policy needs to be written. A. Edelstein noted that it can be helpful to have things codified in the bylaws for future work. B. Morgan noted that it would be a formal process archived along with all the other formal processes of the HIPC like the allocations process. K. Carter noted that he thought all the co-chairs need to be involved. M. Ross-Russell noted that there are times when only a few people to make to Executive Committee so the more people involved the more problematic it may be.

S. Heaven expressed some uncertainty about what would happen if the HIPC did not agree with a decision, what would happen? B. Morgan suggested that if the HIPC chairs had approved to vote a letter of support, the HIPC could vote to withdraw support. A. Edelstein said that a notice could be in the letter to note that the approval was conditional. He added that at times there is a need to move quickly but they do not remove authority of anyone to participate.

The group discussed various scenarios and challenges. M. Ross-Russell said that having a policy and procedures will help her sort through the requests as they come in. She gave some recent examples of requests. B. Morgan noted that drafts of protocols should include things like “must meet current research standards”.

**Motion:** A. Edelstein moved, S. Heaven seconded, that in a situation where a request is made to HIPC and a HIPC meeting is not feasible, the HIPC will authorize the HIPC Co-chairs to make a decision in an in person meeting, and the co-chairs then will provide full information the HIPC at the next meeting when the HIPC will have the ability to approve or disapprove. **Motion passed:** all in favor.

**Motion:** A. Edelstein moved, S. Heaven seconded, for the Executive Committee to develop policies and procedures for participation in research projects. **Motion passed:** all in favor.

B. Morgan said she will draft up and bring it to the next executive meeting.

### **Racial Equity Workgroup**

N. Johns reminded the group that the HIPC approved the Racial Equity Workgroup in February 2019 but that no HIPC members had expressed interest in participating. She directed the group to the proposal in the handouts. She explained that at their last meeting the Comprehensive Planning Committee decided to ask the Executive Committee to review this proposal and decide how to proceed. There were a few options suggested: delegating tasks to committees, asking for some outside support to develop the framework for the HIPC’s racial equity work, and to table the workgroup for another time if there is no interest at this time. L. Diaz noted that this issue is important to the outcomes of our communities and health disparities.

M. Ross-Russell noted that having shared definitions and frameworks will help the work be successful and impactful which is one reason to have an outside facilitator to come aid this work. She agreed with L. Diaz that this should be a priority activity. C. Steib suggested presenting to the HIPC again to see if people will be interested in doing the work. A. Edelstein noted that there could be a requirement to have participation from all the committees. L. Diaz stated that she voted on it but she didn’t know what the ask was in the moment. She noted that the council may need to have another invitation. A. Edelstein suggested someone should agree to be a convener, rather than a chair, which may help. M. Ross Russell stated that she can go over the request again as staff report, since N. Johns will not be at the May HIPC meeting. She noted that this proposal was the result of a public comment in the Fall and work through Comprehensive Planning. M. Ross-Russell suggested that after the ask at the May meeting if there still isn’t a significant number of people signed up that the activities should be divided among the standing committees. B Morgan asked if it should be a discussion item. M. Ross Russell replied that the May agenda is fully packed and the HIPC already had a chance to discussion. The group decided that it would be better for June HIPC meeting. L. Diaz noted that agreement is for the discussion to be brought up in the June discussion items and if there isn’t enough interest the work will be divided among committees.

### **Meeting Times**

L. Diaz asked if this discussion was about this committee or all committees. K. Carter stated that the June Positive Committee is going to be in the evening in order to see if other people attend. C. Steib noted that

some youth may be able to attend meetings in the daytime. M. Ross-Russell suggested that the HIPC may need to consider meeting later in the day, in order to facilitate community participation. She added that many people are not able to come if they are hourly workers, in school, or otherwise not being paid by their employer to attend. She noted that the change didn't need to be every month, but could be quarterly or another schedule. She suggested the evening meetings could be about a subject that would attract community attention. She shared comments shared by other members about schedule conflicts. K. Carter added that the HIPC was losing valuable participation due to schedule conflicts. B. Morgan noted a community member contacted OHP through Facebook and wanted to participate and asked his supervisor if he could attend and was refused. C. Steib asked if there were ever evening meetings. N. Johns noted that there was one group that met in the evening, a group of young HIV+ men several years ago, but that was not an official HIPC committee.

The group discussed that there are concerns about safety, food, and transportation for evening meetings. M. Ross-Russell suggested a meeting time of 5:30-8:00pm. B. Morgan noted that the EMA's HIPC meeting time is unusual for Planning Councils; some meet in the evening, some meet in the morning, and some meet in the late afternoon. The group noted that some planning councils meet for 3-4 hours. L. Diaz said that 4pm-6pm works for her because of her personal and work situations, later than that would be a hardship. A. Edelstein noted that people who live far out in the edges of the EMA may have challenges in attending because of transportation concerns around rush hour.

C. Steib suggested that the Positive Committee act as the pilot program for changing meeting times. K. Carter noted that the Positive Committee is hoping to have young people, working people, women, and other under-represented communities in attendance at their evening meeting. A. Edelstein noted that the HIPC may be a victim of their own success, because there isn't a sense of urgency people don't feel like they need to participate. He noted that people in the suburbs were disconnected from the council and planning. K. Carter noted that there are things happening that the council doesn't know about and people are being harmed by complacency. A. Edelstein commented that the average consumer doesn't even know about community planning and Ryan White, they don't even think about it.

B. Morgan reminded the group that they talked about establishing a regular meeting date. The committee had settled on right before the Comprehensive Planning committee on the third Thursday. The committee discussed various options of times. B. Morgan noted that there are no co-chairs for Comprehensive Planning at this meeting because they resigned. The group decided the next meeting for the third Thursday in August from 12-2pm and will revisit after the new CPC chairs.

#### **Old Business.**

None.

#### **New Business.**

None.

#### **Announcements.**

S. Heaven announced that the HOPWA grant was \$7.3 million dollars which is a small cut. She noted that people will not lose their housing but programs are being streamlined.

B. Morgan noted that the NJ was having a meeting about End the Epidemic Listening Session on May 9<sup>th</sup> 6pm in Camden. She can forward the information to anyone interested.

**Adjournment.**

C. Steib asked for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, A. Edelstein seconded to adjourn at 3:39pm. **Motion passed:** all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole D. Johns, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting agenda
- Meeting minutes for February 7, 2019
- Racial Equity Workgroup Proposal
- OHP meeting calendar

DRAFT





## **Article VI: Code of Conduct**

**Section 1.** All persons attending any meeting of the Planning Council or one of its committees are entitled to participation as discussed in the bylaws. However, in the event that any person, regardless of Planning Council membership, is called out of order by the Planning Council or Committee Co-Chair/s during a meeting, the following actions shall be taken to restore order to the meeting:

- a. First incident: The disruptive person/s is called out of order by the Co-Chair/s.
- b. Second incident: The disruptive person/s is put on notice that he/she/they are out of order.
- c. Third incident: The Co-Chair/s shall call a five minute recess of the meeting.
- d. Fourth incident: The Co-Chair/s shall ask the disruptive person to leave the meeting.

# Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council

Research Approval Process

*August 2019*

**Purpose.** On occasion, researchers may request the participation of the Planning Council when conducting their projects. This participation may include presentations to the Planning Council, soliciting feedback from the Planning Council, approval of letters of acknowledgement, or other tasks that involve the Planning Council as a whole.

**Basic Criteria for Research Projects.** Any research projects must meet current standards for research. The Planning Council may only participate in research projects that fit with the purpose and availability of the Planning Council. The Planning Council will not participate in any research projects that interfere with their ability to uphold their regular responsibilities. Preference is given to local research projects.

**Process for Obtaining Planning Council Participation in Research Projects.** OHP staff will review all requests to ensure they meet the minimum criteria. Any research project that does not meet the minimum criteria will be declined. Once it is determined that a project meets the minimum criteria, it will move on to the Planning Council. It is preferable for researchers seeking support to attend a Planning Council meeting, present on the research project, and allow the Planning Council to vote on their participation. However, in some rare instances, a decision may be required before the next meeting of the Planning Council. In these instances, the Planning Council Co-Chairs will meet to make a decision on behalf of the Planning Council. At the next regular meeting of the Planning Council, the Planning Council will vote on whether to confirm or override the decision made by the Co-Chairs.