



HIV Health Services Planning Council
POLICY AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
WORK GROUP
DRAFT MINUTES
Thursday, January 31st, 2008
San Francisco Department of Public Health
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 330B
4:00 – 6:00 pm

Council Members Present: Allgaier, Harrison, Ramos, Andrews, Manley, Frazier, Banks

Council Support Present: Jack Newby, Channing Wayne

1. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4:17 PM by Co-Chair Allgaier and everyone introduced themselves.

2. Review/Approve Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and approved.

3. Review, discuss and develop recommendations for possible changes in Planning Council Structure for Policy and Evaluation Meeting scheduled for February 7

Discussion included:

- Co-Chair Allgaier announced that he had requested that Council Co-Chair Manley facilitate the meeting due to the fact that he did not want any bias (perceived or actual) to be present in the facilitation since the group was reviewing his proposal.
- One of the reasons why we embarked on this journey was to increase consumer retention on the council.
- It was recommended that there be a by-law change- that the HIV positive Co-Chair is made to be an unaffiliated consumer Council Member.
- There were three recommendations for Council Support:
 - To continue to contract with the diversity consultant.
 - To increase the training/orientation program of new members including such skills as leadership and budget reading and analysis.
 - To tighten up the mentorship program from its current loose status of people having the choice of whether or not they want a mentor, and how much time is actually spent mentoring the new members.
- There are some committees that are mandated such as POI. It was also stated that some form of a Steering and a Membership Committees should be in place.

- If we are disbanding the Policy and Evaluation Committee, Steering should absorb some of these responsibilities such as the structural and procedural issues that the Policy and Evaluation Committee now perform.
- Many of the recommendations are based upon the work of our consultant-Veronica Neal.
- One of the proposals was to make sure that any recommendations put forth from a committee include any debate that happened at that committee level so that all members feel that all voices are heard in the presentation to the full council.
- Policy and Evaluation, Community Outreach and Advocacy, and Planning would be eliminated. Two new, as yet to be named committees, would be put in their place.
- The new structure of the Steering Committee would be the Council's 3 Co-Chairs, 1 Co-Chair from each of the 4 committees, the POI Co-Chair and some number, to be determined after more discussion, of At-Large members. This would facilitate in the training and developing of leadership skills in members.
- The new structure of the Membership Committee would be to oversee the Council's activities in recruitment, training, mentorship, and leadership development.
- For the remainder of this document, the other two committees will be called Committee A and Committee B.
 - Committee A would be responsible for educating Council Members on specific underserved communities of consumers and emerging issues for consumers, bringing representatives from other agencies to do presentations and responsible for needs assessments. The specific areas of concentration could be developed annually.
 - Committee B would be responsible for educating the Council Members on issues mandated per legislation and ensuring that the Council receives information from DPH (e.g. reports and presentations from the HHS and information from providers (HAPN, Part C and D providers etc.))
- It is felt that there is not equity among the committees with the Planning Committee having too much "power" and with Community Outreach and Advocacy not having enough "power" or influence over the decisions of the council.
- It was suggested strongly that we renegotiate our MOU with Points of Integration to gain additional seats on the committee.

Questions about the recommendations included:

- How often will the diversity consultant be attending to ensure that we are not forgetting about our cultural competency goals?
- How would the "debate" in the committees be brought to the council?

- Was it thought out in terms of distribution of responsibility to the committees?

Answers included:

- The Council Director stated that it was important to have an outside consultant do this work for the council and that he planned to have the consultant at least for the next year providing coaching to the co-chairs and committee co-chairs and addressing the sensitivity of the training of consumers and keeping them involved.
- He also stated that he would like to see small focus groups in about 6 months to get feedback on how this process is working.
- As far as the debate issue was concerned, it was suggested that the presentation to the Full Council include what the debate contained and that the debate would also be included in the packet and available on-line via audio recording of the meeting.
- It was not the intent of this work group to finish with a completed document of how the committees would be organized or what responsibilities they would hold.

Other comments included:

- How do we include the needs of Underserved Populations in all committees?
- We need an in-your-face approach to how we are serving the underserved and/or disproportionately impacted populations.
- We should have representation in other arenas such as DPH through their work with groups that serve special populations.
- There should be a conscience effort to rotate members through the different committees and that the committees should have a proportionate mix of consumers and providers.
- There should be rotation of Co-Chairs so that Council Members have the opportunity to learn leadership skills.
- Let our connections with other agencies be the starting point in building relationships so that we can have an official seat at the table in these organizations.
- There was a dissenting opinion that the new structure of the committee suggested to be named the Consumer Affairs Committee was no more than an extension of the Community Outreach and Advocacy Committee- that it is not addressing the need of the consumer.
- There were many responses to this opinion; many suggesting that the proposed re-structuring was inclusive and addressed the needs of these populations.
- Rebuttal was that unless the agenda or definition of the purpose of the committee is specifically designated as a structure around the needs of women

and minorities it was not meeting the goal of meeting the needs of women and minorities.

- A question came up as to whether there was input from others into the drafting of this proposal. The response was that it was the purpose of this meeting to increase input from as many voices as possible as the meeting was announced to everyone and open to any who chose to attend to voice their concerns.
- It was stated that Veronica Neal (diversity consultant), stated that the council should have a women and minority affairs committee.
- It was asked how this committee would differ from the Community Outreach and Advocacy and it was answered that although we need to prioritize our outreach to the underserved populations, we need to still remember all populations affected by HIV.
- It was stated that issues involving women and minorities should not be relegated to one committee, but should be addressed at all levels of council structure and business.
- It was assured that in no way is this proposal the final draft and there is room for compromise as to the details such as to the name of the committee, the purpose of the committee, the function and/or responsibilities of the committee.
- It is a major concern of this group that the Policies and Procedures are not available after all of the work done to put them together.
- In regards to the orientation and training there needs to be a comprehensive packet to be read by all new council members and signed off on by the member stating that s/he has read the packet and that s/he understands it.
- The orientation process should be expanded to be about 3 months instead of the possible 3 weeks now offered.
- The orientation process should contain a presentation from each committee telling the member what exactly the committee does.
- It was then stated that if we are to give someone who may not have the level of reading skill and comprehension required to understand the material, that someone is willing to sit with them and make sure that s/he understands it.
- It was suggested that members bring suggestions to next week's meeting. Recommended suggestions are for names of the different Committees, the functions of the different Committee and how the membership of each Committee is structured.

4. Next Meeting Date & Agenda Items

- *The next meeting of the work group will be determined. The next Policy and Evaluation meeting is scheduled for 4:30 – 6:30, Thursday, February 7th, 2008, 25 Van Ness, Room 330B, San Francisco.*

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:43 by Co-Chair Manley.

.