

**Philadelphia HIV Prevention Planning Group (HPG)
Ryan White Part A Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia EMA
Integrated Executive Committee**

March 2, 2017

12:00-2:00p.m.

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107

Present: Tre Alexander, Katelyn Baron, Kevin Burns, Jennifer Chapman, Gerry Keys, Clint Steib

Excused: Michael Cappuccilli, Alan Edelstein, Adam Thompson

Absent: Keith Carter, David Gana, Nancy Santiago

Call to Order: C. Steib called the meeting to order at 12:18p.m.

Welcome/Introductions: C. Steib welcomed committee members and guests. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda: C. Steib presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** T. Alexander moved, K. Baron seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes: C. Steib presented the September 21, 2016 meeting minutes for approval. **Motion:** G. Keys moved, K. Burns seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Staff: No report.

Discussion Items:

- **Bylaws**

B. Morgan stated that she had drafted updates to the bylaws based on previous suggestions from the Integrated Executive Committee. She noted that references to the Planning Council were highlighted, since the title of the integrated body would be changed, but the group had not yet chosen a new name. She said that references to the CDC and prevention services had been added. She noted that Article 1, Sections 4 and 6 were combined into one item due to redundancy, noting that co-chairs as well as OHP staff would work with AACO. She pointed out that any changes in the bylaws were marked in red and underlined. She added that, on pg. 4, an adjustment had been made to the list of officers of the Planning Body. She stated that the Integrated Executive Committee had discussed having 3 co-chairs for an interim period, in which a third co-chair would be added to represent prevention services, in addition to the RWPC's previous system of having 2 co-chairs, at least one of whom was HIV positive.

B. Morgan pointed the group to the committee section of the bylaws, on pg. 7. She said

that the term Integrated was removed from the Integrated Executive Committee name, and the Prevention Committee was added to the list of committees.

C. Steib pointed the group to pg. 4, Section 1. He asked if the current governmental co-chair of the HPG would step down. M. Ross-Russell stated that one possibility would be for the governmental co-chair to still act as a co-chair of the Prevention Committee but not the whole Planning Body. B. Morgan pointed out that the HPG had historically had a governmental co-chair, but the RWPC did not have any members from the recipient. M. Ross-Russell stated that the Ryan White legislation did not require or prohibit having a governmental co-chair.

K. Baron noted that on pg. 4, Section 1, the term “neither” should be replaced with another term, given that there would be 3 co-chairs of the integrated body. B. Morgan suggested changing the language about staggered terms. K. Burns asked if co-chair terms could be changed to 3 years, so that one co-chair would be elected each year.

C. Steib asked if the prevention co-chair would be the same co-chair who was already serving in the HPG or if a new co-chair would be nominated and elected. M. Ross-Russell replied that the co-chair could stay the same or a new one could be nominated. She said the co-chair would be expected to have experience with prevention, but a nomination and vote would take place for the position. B. Morgan stated that there was a 30-day nominations period for co-chairs, followed by an election at the next meeting. M. Ross-Russell noted that the co-chair nominations period began in September each year, and typically a new co-chair was elected in October or November. B. Morgan said the integration of the bodies would create a special case. She stated that a special election could be held, or the group could elect a co-chair on an interim basis. She said it would be up to the HPG and RWPC to decide.

C. Steib asked how nominations for staggered co-chair elections would work. B. Morgan said that, traditionally, one new co-chair was elected each year, for a term of 2 years. She reiterated that the group had suggested extending the co-chair terms to 3 years. K. Burns pointed out that electing a co-chair each year would leave 2 co-chairs remaining with experience in serving the group. He said that extending terms to 3 years would allow the current process of electing a co-chair each year to continue.

C. Steib noted that the group had not yet formally decided to have 3 co-chairs. K. Burns asked if the current co-chairs felt that a third co-chair would be helpful. K. Baron stated that having another co-chair might be helpful if one co-chair could not make it to a meeting. T. Alexander noted that he had many responsibilities at his job that sometimes prevented him from attending meetings. J. Chapman stated that the prevention co-chair acted as a delegate to UCHAPS. She said that keeping three co-chairs would ensure someone could fulfill this responsibility. K. Baron stated that she supported moving forward with 3 co-chairs and changing the bylaws in the future if needed. She suggested that calling the prevention co-chair position “temporary” undermined the importance of

prevention voices in the integrated body. T. Alexander said he was in favor of having 3 co-chairs, in order to honor the importance of HPG participation in the integrated body. He said that the policy would promote inclusivity.

B. Morgan noted that there would need to be a prevention leadership position in addition to the prevention co-chair of the entire planning body, as the Prevention Committee would need a co-chair as well. K. Baron pointed out that the Planning Council co-chair and the Prevention Committee co-chair could not be the same person. C. Steib asked why the position could not be filled by the same person. K. Baron stated that, as far as she knew, no one could serve as a co-chair for both the planning body and a committee. C. Steib asked which co-chair would serve as a delegate to UCHAPS. J. Chapman stated that the group was expected to have 2 delegates, including a governmental representative, and one alternate to UCHAPS. K. Burns said the alternate could be a member of the Prevention Committee.

K. Baron asked how many people would be on the integrated body, as of now. B. Morgan replied that there were currently 37 approved members. K. Burns noted that the Nominations Committee was always recruiting new members. K. Baron asked what the maximum membership would be. B. Morgan responded that the current maximum number of Planning Council members was 55. C. Steib stated that he knew of a provider who was interested in joining the integrated body, and he had informed her of the application deadline. K. Baron asked if the Nominations Committee could hold application review earlier than usual this year. B. Morgan replied that they could, but the current nominations cycle was timed in order to allow members to become familiar with RWPC procedures before allocations. She stated that applications were reviewed annually in March and September, but they were accepted all year. B. Morgan stated that the OHP would be doing more membership outreach with an emphasis on integration. She said that she anticipated new members would apply in response to integration.

C. Steib asked if the OHP tabled at the AIDS Education Month Prevention and Outreach Summit. B. Morgan responded that they usually did. M. Ross-Russell said that the planning body co-chairs may be asked to do an overview of the plan as part of a presentation with AACO at the Prevention and Outreach Summit

B. Morgan stated that J. Hayes and A. Boone were currently conducting social media outreach to recruit new members. M. Ross-Russell pointed out that 1/3 of the Planning Council must be comprised of unaligned consumers. She asked the group to reach out to consumers who may be interested in joining. She stated that some people had been unable to remain on the RWPC due to the requirement to submit a tax certification. She said that recruitment would be very important moving forward. M. Ross-Russell noted that the group currently had 35 members. C. Steib asked if there was an age criterion for members. M. Ross-Russell responded that there wasn't. She stated that recruitment of youth would be useful. She said that it was preferable that members did not need parental consent to attend meetings. B. Morgan noted that the priority for recruitment was

individuals who were consumers and not affiliated with providers. She added that there were currently no members whose primary area of representation was use of prevention services. She said that more African American males were currently needed on the Planning Council. She noted that direct recruitment was often the most successful.

M. Ross-Russell said that the membership list had recently been submitted to the recipient following the receipt of tax certification forms. She stated that the second stage of membership approval was currently being completed. She said there were issues for 2 members currently. She said that, if one member was lost, there would be 35 members. She stated that losing more members may cause the group to be in violation of their bylaws.

M. Ross-Russell suggested that the committees be rearranged to alphabetical order on the bylaws.

Motion: C. Steib moved, K. Burns seconded to extend co-chair terms to 3 years. Motion passed: All in favor.

- **Term Limits**

B. Morgan referenced pg. 4, Section 7, Part A in the bylaws. She noted that members were permitted to serve 4-year terms, with a 1-year break before reapplying. She said that the bylaws were last updated 4 years ago. She noted that some members' term limits would be reached soon. She suggested that current members seek out people in their organizations who did similar work to apply to join the Planning Council. She recommended bringing these people to a meeting to introduce them to the idea of HIV planning. M. Ross-Russell asked members to consider how long it took them to become familiar with the planning process. She suggested helping to familiarize potential members with the process.

J. Chapman asked if integration would restart the membership terms. M. Ross-Russell stated that the group could decide whether or not to do this. She explained that, at the last Integrated Executive Committee meeting, the group had discussed whether or not to dissolve and reform the care and prevention bodies. She said they decided against it to avoid interrupting Planning Council operations. She said that tax certificates had recently been submitted to the mayor's office, so the 4-term time period could be restarted at the time that appointments were made.

K. Burns said that resetting terms at the same time might cause a large number of members' terms to expire all at once. J. Chapman asked if member attrition prevented this kind of situation. M. Ross-Russell explained that some people had served on the Planning Council for a long time. She said that these members would likely have their terms expire at the same time. She said that other members who had joined recently would have staggered term expirations. She noted that the group lost many members during the recent appointment process. She said that the group benefitted from having

members with experience. She stated that experienced members could help new members learn the planning process.

J. Chapman asked experienced members of the RWPC how they felt about restarting the four-term limit. K. Baron stated that she supported it. She said that she'd like if experienced members who were on the Planning Council before she joined were able to stay and share their knowledge. She noted that she was still learning more after being on the RWPC for around 3 years. K. Burns stated that he'd completed 4 2-year terms of Planning Council membership already, and would be unlikely to remain a RWPC member for 4 more terms. T. Alexander stated that he'd been on the RWPC for 4 or 5 years. He said that there was a great deal to learn for Planning Council members. K. Burns said that it took at least 2 years to understand the planning process.

T. Alexander asked if resetting the membership terms would mean that all members began their term from day 1. M. Ross-Russell replied that it would, following membership appointment. J. Chapman asked if the group could take into account the current amount of time left in each person's membership cycle. M. Ross-Russell stated that the group could make some sort of plan in order to stagger membership expiration. K. Baron asked how long co-chairs could serve. M. Ross-Russell said that they could serve until their membership terms expired, if they were reelected.

M. Ross-Russell said that the Planning Council bylaws specified that a member of the recipient staff could not chair the RWPC. She explained that the Ryan White legislation said that the Planning Body could not be solely chaired by a member of the recipient staff. She stated that the Philadelphia EMA bylaws specified a preference that recipient staff not chair the planning body.

B. Morgan stated that the group needed to review updates to the content of the bylaws that had already been made. She said she'd also fix inconsistent spacing in the document and other formatting issues, with the group's consent. The group agreed to the changes in formatting by general consensus. B. Morgan said that the 3 year co-chair term limits would be added. She explained that the voting procedure for the bylaws was specified in the bylaws themselves. She stated that the planning body needed to be given 30 days advance notice before voting on the bylaws, which would then need to be approved by 2/3 of members present at the meeting.

- **Prevention Committee Meeting Schedule**

B. Morgan stated that the Prevention Committee would need to decide on a time to meet. She said that they could discuss keeping the date and time the same as the current HPG meeting. She added that they could discuss the date at the March HPG meeting and the April integrated meeting. M. Ross-Russell stated that HPG members would be asked to attend other committees as well. She said that current RWPC members may also join the Prevention Committee. K. Baron suggested the schedule be discussed at the RWPC meeting next week. J. Chapman asked if the RWPC meeting time had always been on a

Thursday. She asked for more information on how meeting schedules were determined.

M. Ross-Russell said that, in the past few years, the Nominations Committee had done a needs assessment regarding the needs of the planning body as a whole. She stated that meeting times were included in the needs assessment. She noted that such an assessment had not been done recently. However, the last needs assessment had found that the current meeting time was most convenient for most people. She said that members who could not regularly attend meetings could request accommodations or a leave of absence, particularly if they were sick. J. Chapman noted that every year, around a certain point, UCHAPS reassessed participants' availability for meetings. She suggest the Planning Council do something similar.

K. Baron asked if it would be beneficial to do a survey about moving the meeting time. She stated that this would be a question for the Nominations Committee, which had done the needs assessment in the past. B. Morgan said that the membership satisfaction survey had also asked about mentorship needs and other factors. K. Baron asked if it would be beneficial to conduct a survey again. K. Burns noted that he would not be at next week's Nominations Committee meeting. He said that it the idea of a membership needs assessment could be put on the agenda at Nominations and then presented to the RWPC at their full meeting. M. Ross-Russell stated that she would suggest following up with the Nominations Committee, which may do an assessment of membership needs in the future. J. Chapman said that a needs assessment may reveal areas where the group could reach out for technical assistance in the future.

C. Steib asked when the last membership needs assessment was done. B. Morgan replied that it had been 4 or 5 years. K. Burns said he thought it would be useful to do another needs assessment. He asked if it had been done through Survey Monkey, and B. Morgan responded that it had. J. Chapman suggested working on a membership satisfaction survey over the course of the next year. Then, the group could track the progress of the planning body following integration. K. Baron pointed out that some issues that would come up after integration may not be anticipated. J. Chapman said that meeting on Thursdays may be difficult for her.

C. Steib asked if members had been able to call into meetings in the past. B. Morgan said, to be counted as present, members must be physically in the room. However, she stated that members had been able to call into smaller committee meetings in the past. She said that presenters had conferenced in before as well. K. Burns pointed out that call-in participation to RWPC meetings would not work, as the room was large. B. Morgan said the OHP did not have the technology to support virtual participation in large Planning Council meetings.

- **Name for New Integrated Body**

C. Steib asked if the integrated planning body would discuss their new name when they met for the first time. He said that the Integrated Executive Committee could also come

up with a name and propose it to the group. J. Chapman noted that the group had previously discussed bringing up the name to the planning body, perhaps as a contest. K. Burns asked if any names had been suggested. M. Ross-Russell replied that they had. She said that the Ryan White legislation called the Planning Council the “HIV Health Services Planning Council.” She stated that another possibility was the “Integrated Health Services Planning Council.” She reiterated that a contest could be held at a planning body meeting. J. Chapman suggested using the legislative language for the purposes of the current bylaws. She said the group could then ask the planning body for suggestions of an informal name. The Integrated Executive Committee agreed to the suggestion by general consensus.

M. Ross-Russell said that the legislative language referred to the planning body as the “Planning Council” throughout the rest of the document. K. Burns stated that the integrated group may continue to be called the Planning Council. He noted that placing the legislative name in the bylaws would allow them to be distributed to the planning body in advance of selecting a name. B. Morgan asked if the group would need to include the Philadelphia EMA in the planning body’s name. M. Ross-Russell noted that members from the PA counties and NJ may feel excluded if the planning body was named simply for Philadelphia. C. Steib suggested that the name refer to the “Philadelphia region.” K. Baron said that the Philadelphia EMA could be included in the group’s description but not the formal name. M. Ross-Russell stated that the planning body could discuss the ideas and choose which they liked the best.

B. Morgan asked the group if they’d like to vote on the bylaws after all members were appointed. M. Ross-Russell stated that the Planning Council could continue doing business until members were formally appointed. She said that it was unknown when the appointment process would be completed. K. Baron asked if current HPG members would be permitted to vote on the bylaw changes. M. Ross-Russell stated that all names of the planning body members, including former HPG members, had been submitted for official appointment. She said that all these members, with 2 exceptions, were continuing to go through the appointment process. Therefore, the former HPG members could officially vote for the time being. K. Baron asked if the HPG and RWPC would vote on the bylaws separately. K. Burns noted that integration would be completed in April. B. Morgan said that it was possible to refrain from submitting the bylaws for approval for the time being, until the name was decided. She stated that the proposed changes could be presented at the April integrated meeting for approval in May.

K. Burns suggested presenting the change in the bylaws now, so the planning body could have a longer amount of time to review them. B. Morgan said that 30 day written notice was required, but there didn’t need to be a formal presentation.

B. Morgan said that next Thursday, at the RWPC meeting, the group would discuss the name for the integrated group. She stated that, after the meeting, the name could be added to the bylaws. Then, the bylaws could be distributed via email to the RWPC and HPG for

comment and revision on March 10th. Comments would be accepted for 30 days, and then voting could be held at the first integrated planning body meeting on April 13th. C. Steib said the name change could be placed on the agenda for the HPG meeting. G. Keys asked how many former HPG members had been approved for RWPC membership. M. Ross-Russell said that 6 had. G. Keys asked how many RWPC members had been lost in the certification process. M. Ross-Russell replied that the membership had fallen from 44 to 38 and the Planning Council may lose an additional 3 during the process. She noted that some people did not respond to attempts to contact them about the tax certification process, so they were no longer Planning Council members. The group agreed by general consensus to the plan.

B. Morgan reiterated that the name for the integrated body would be included on the HPG agenda. C. Steib directed the group to pg. 7 of the bylaws. He asked if this section accurately expressed the purpose of the prevention side. M. Ross-Russell stated that it was a generic description based on the current responsibilities of the planning groups. She said that the HPG would be invited to make comments on and potentially revise the section. J. Chapman said that this section of the bylaws allowed for a great deal of flexibility. M. Ross-Russell stated that flexibility might allow the group to continue redefining their role moving forward.

J. Chapman pointed out that many organizations had bylaws as well as a strategic plan. B. Morgan noted that the Positive Committee had its own mission statement, and the Prevention Committee could also have a mission statement. K. Burns asked if the HPG currently had a mission statement. J. Chapman replied that she did not believe they did. M. Ross-Russell stated that the group could reference the HPG orientation manual to see if there currently was an HPG mission statement. C. Steib asked if the manual was online. B. Morgan stated that it could be emailed to him.

Old Business: None.

New Business: C. Steib asked if there was a group of people from the area going to the AIDSWatch from March 27-28 in Washington D.C. that would be willing to coordinate their activities. T. Alexander stated that he had a colleague who would be serving as a delegate. J. Chapman said that, when she'd participated in the past, each person was given an individual schedule. She stated that she'd recently heard that each area had its own delegate who coordinated visits. K. Burns said that this delegate would help to train and organize the group from each state. T. Alexander gave the group contact information for his colleague who was serving as a regional delegate for the event¹.

Announcements: K. Burns stated that the CAEAR Coalition would be conducting Capitol Hill visits in Washington, D.C. next week.

¹ Teresa Sullivan: Teresa@FIGHT.org or 215-525-0460, ext. 405

Adjournment:

Motion: K. Baron moved, T. Alexander seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:00p.m.

Motion passed: All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Jennifer Hayes, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- October 20, 2016 Meeting Minutes
- Draft Bylaws
- OHP Calendar