

**HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Executive Committee  
Monday, May 7, 2018  
12-2pm**

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

**Present:** Katelyn Baron, Alan Edelstein, Dave Gana, Sharee Heaven, Loretta Matus, Adam Thompson

**Excused:** Kevin Burns, Michael Cappuccilli, Keith Carter, Tiffany Dominique, Gerry Keys, Jeanette Murdock, Clint Steib

**Absent:** Jen Chapman

**Guests:** None

**Staff:** Briana Morgan, Stephen Budhu

**Call to Order:** L. Matus called the meeting to order at 12:08pm.

**Approval of Agenda:** L. Matus presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** K. Baron moved, A. Thompson seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion Passed:** All in favor.

**Approval of Minutes:** L. Matus presented the minutes for approval. **Motion:** K. Baron moved, A. Thompson seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion Passed:** All in favor.

**Report of Staff:** B. Morgan informed the committee the HIPC now has the ability to host conference calls for meetings. This topic will be discussed in greater detail later on in today's meeting.

**Action Items:** None

**Discussion Items:**

- **Conference Calls**

B. Morgan reiterated the HIPC now has the ability to host conference calls. She suggested the Executive Committee should first review the HIPC bylaws before continuing discussion, since conference calling was not allowed under current bylaws. The bylaws also do not allow proxy voting or virtual attendance. B. Morgan suggested the committee should consider in what circumstances would conference calling be appropriate, how many times would attendance by conference call be permitted, and how would attendance be counted for those who participate via conference call. Should it be considered an excused absence for those who attend meetings via conference call or should a new category for attendance be considered? Also, would conference calls be best suited for presentation-based meeting were voting is not required? A. Thompson suggested the committee should explore using conference calls for meetings that do not require voting, such as meetings with no "Action Items" or major discussion topics. A good setting would be meetings that featured presentations.

After brief discussion about conference calling A. Thompson suggested the HIPC should look to use the Zoom Video Conferencing platform for its meetings. He explained he has used the Zoom platform in the past during other planning meetings. He noted the platform was quite useful and he proceeded to list the pros of the platform. Pros include:

- Face to Face discussion

- “Raise hand” feature that allows individuals to speak one at a time; useful for asking questions during a meeting
- Presentations can be shared with the caller

B. Morgan noted the Office of HIV Planning does have a Zoom account, but 2-way video would not be used during meetings. The HIPC could broadcast slides and presentations to the caller but the council would not be able to see the caller. A. Thompson expressed his disapproval and strongly suggested the HIPC should use 2-way video to ensure that those who are calling in to the meeting are actively participating.

A. Thompson shared his experiences with other planning bodies that use conference calling. He stated other planning bodies meet monthly, but meetings alternate between in-person and conference calls. During conference call meetings the group would review data or other presentation-based material; all voting was conducted during the in-person meetings. K. Baron stated it was a good idea to use the same structure that A. Thompson mentioned but the HIPC may not always know what meetings will require voting ahead of time. K. Baron added virtual attendance would be acceptable but she did not agree with proxy voting. She suggested guidelines about conference calling could be sent out to HIPC members when reminder emails are sent out with the meeting per view.

S. Heaven referenced the discussion from the committee’s February 2018 meeting. She asked if conference calling was being explored as a way to improve attendance and if the committee would be changing how attendance was counted for those who attended HIPC meetings via conference call. If a formal recommendation was made from the Executive Committee would it be taken to the Nominations Committee to review, enforce, and then recommend to the HIPC? A. Thompson replied he recommended conference calling at the last Executive Committee meeting.

B. Morgan suggested the use of conference calls could first be used in the HIPC’s subcommittees since there is a smaller audience than that of the entire Planning Council. In some cases subcommittee discussions do not require voting. A. Thompson suggested the committee should first look to see if other Part A Planning Councils use conference calling and in what manner is it used before approving the use of conference calls. The committee should ask the Recipient how conference calls are used within the Part A planning process as well. L. Matus agreed with A. Thompson’s suggestion.

A. Thompson asked if this recommendation should be taken to the Nominations Committee. He suggested the committee should review the average number of absences in a fiscal year per member to see the potential benefit conference calling will have on attendance. B. Morgan replied attendance is tracked and it is reviewed by the Nominations Committee quarterly.

L. Matus suggested meeting packets should be sent out ahead of time so those who attend meetings via conference call will have a better grasp of conversation. A. Edelstein agreed. L. Matus suggested conference calls should be handled committee by committee; the Positive Committee would be a good place for conference calls but the Finance Committee may not be best suited due to the nature of their discussion. A. Edelstein disagreed, he stated all committees could work with conference calling with the assumption no voting was requirement during that particular meeting. A. Thompson suggested the conference should be handled committee by committee. Whether or not a committee decides to use conference calling should be at the discretion of its co-chairs.

- **Co-Chair Structure**

B. Morgan reminded the committee HIPC officer terms were expiring in September 2018. From the committee's February discussion, the committee was leaning more towards a 3-officer structure as opposed to 4, which is the current structure. Also, the committee discussed consumer involvement and the requirement for the PLWH representation in the officer position. A. Thompson asked if the PLWH representation has been discussed within the Positive Committee. B. Morgan replied no, not as yet, but she would make sure it was added to the Positive Committee's May 2018 agenda. K. Baron suggested conversation about PLWH representation in the officer position should be tabled until it is discussed within the Positive Committee.

The committee shifted its discussion to overall co-chair structure. They reviewed the pros and cons of the current co-chair structure of 4 and the proposed of 3. A. Edelstein asked what the bylaws says about co-chair structure. B. Morgan replied by quoting the bylaws, "The Planning Council shall be chaired by four Co-Chairs. At least one Co-Chair shall be HIV-positive, and at least one Co-Chair shall represent the HIV prevention service system. No Co-Chair shall be a fiscal agent through which the City of Philadelphia contracts for Part A services or administrative support but may be an employee of an agency that is a recipient of Part A funds. Three of the Co-Chair positions shall be elected annually and shall serve terms of three years, which will be staggered. The fourth Co-Chair will be selected by the recipient and will act as the governmental Co-Chair."

A. Thompson asked if the current structure of 4 consisted of one PLWH, one co-chair from care, one from prevention and one governmental chair. B. Morgan replied yes. A. Edelstein stated since the HIPC as recently integrated so it may not be necessary to distinguish between prevention and care. S. Heaven agreed. A. Thompson asked if there was a requirement to distinguish between care and prevention. Often providers offer both prevention and care services. In the case of the community-based organizations they may only offer prevention services. L. Matus stated she no longer feels the need to distinguish between care and prevention the more important issue is discussing PLWH representation in the officer position. If the current structure is 4, should the HIPC consider having two officer who are HIV-positive?

A. Thompson suggested the committee should revisit what defines the term "consumer". Should someone who uses PrEP be considered a "consumer"? K. Baron noted in an ideal situation there would be an officer who is HIV-positive and then another officer who is on PrEP.

A. Thompson asked the committee if they wanted to continue with the current structure of 4 co-chairs or move forward with 3 co-chairs that was proposed in the February meeting. The committee proposed using a 3 Co-chair structure and recommending the following:

- 1 community-based co-chair (1-year term)
- 1 "consumer" (2-year term)
- 1 Recipient (indefinite term)
- staggered terms (2 years)

K. Baron suggested the terms of co-chairs should be staggered so a veteran co-chair would always be chairing meeting. K. Baron suggested the language of the bylaws should allow room for change in the future.

**Motion:** The Executive Committee moved to recommend a 3-co-chair structure to the HIPC as it is listed above.

- **Committees**

B. Morgan stated the Planning Council has not recently discussed the meeting times of subcommittees. Recently meeting attendance has been poor, she suggested the Executive committee could discuss the HIPC subcommittees and their meeting times. A. Thompson stated it was difficult for him to attend 2-3 meetings a month. He asked if the Comprehensive Planning Committee could meet on the same day as the Planning Council. B. Morgan reminded A. Thompson that the Nominations Committee already meets at 12 pm on the same Thursday as the Planning Council. A. Thompson asked if it was possible to have concurrent meetings. B. Morgan replied the Office of HIV Planning is mandated to take minutes for meetings and at this point there is only one staff position designation for taking meeting minutes. Therefore, concurrent meetings would not be possible under current OHP structure. A. Thompson asked if the Comprehensive Planning Committee could meet before the Nominations Committee at 10am-12pm. A. Thompson also asked if a non-staff member could take minutes. He stated he would be willing to find an intern from his organization to take minutes.

A. Edelstein stated the Finance Committee's meeting times are good, there is a core group of people who usually attend and provide good discussion. He did not feel the meeting day or time needed to be changed for the Finance Committee.

B. Morgan suggested the committee should explore the use of conference calls to alleviate some of the issues pertaining to attendance.

L. Matus asked if all committees needed to meet every month. A. Edelstein replied the Finance Committee only meets when there is work to do. B. Morgan added committees do not need to meet every month, it depends on the amount of work that the committee needs to do. In the past there were committees and ad hoc work groups that met as needed.

A. Thompson asked how many members the Nominations Committee has. S. Heaven replied it's a small group of 6. A. Thompson suggested maybe the Nominations and Comprehensive Planning Committee could swap meeting days/times since the Comprehensive Planning Committee was a larger group.

A. Thompson suggested it may be useful to poll HIPC members their availability and what subcommittee they were a part of and what subcommittee were they most interested in. A. Thompson stated some members may be on certain subcommittees because their availability aligns with the meeting time of that committee. If enough members reply they wished to change committees but are unable due to their availability then the HIPC should explore changing meeting times and days of committees. The committee agreed. S. Heaven noted that all committees may wish to meet before the Planning Council for convenience.

A. Thompson reiterated the committee should look to find additional persons to take minutes, in order to have concurrent meetings. He asked if a non-Office of HIV Planning staff has ever taken minutes. B. Morgan replied not to her knowledge. Besides taking minutes there are other responsibilities that are associated with the position. That position is privy to sensitive information, e.g.; access to meeting recordings and member contact information. Meeting minutes are also reviewed by another OHP staff member and edited as necessary. A. Edelstein stated if a non-staff member took minutes a conflict of interest may be presented especially if that person was employed by a Part A subrecipient. In that scenario there would be no way to ensure the minutes are an accurate synopsis of meetings, someone may alter the minutes so that the minutes are in the best interest of that particular agency from which they are employed.

**Old Business:** None

**New Business:** None

**Announcements:** None

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned by consensus at 1:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephen Budhu, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes
- OHP Calendar

DRAFT

