



HIV PREVENTION COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Tuesday, November 28, 2012

Indiana Memorial Union, Walnut Conference Room

Bloomington, Indiana 47405

AGENDA

- 9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m. Welcome:** Andrea Perez, ISDH Co-Chair
Self-Introductions: Each member introduced themselves and the seat the represented.
Ground Rules: Brian Revalee
Review of Agenda: Andrea Perez
- 9:10 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. Approval of September 18, 2012 CPG Minutes:** There was a consensus to accept the minutes with no corrections.
Review of Group Assessment Form:

Question #1: We need to look at how quick we are to discharge members. We need to look at things that may be going on in their lives.

Question: We have an appeals process are you saying we should look at this?

Reply: No I think the policy is sort of punitive it is not inviting, I think we need to look at the policy. I think this is part of the problem with retention.

Question: Could we look into an exit survey?

Reply: We do have one.

Reply: I would like to hear from members who have left; been discharged or left to get their input on what happened.

Reply: In any removal letter the member is reminded in the letter that there is an appeals process.

Question: Of the four people that were removed did we receive appeals from them?

Reply: No we didn't.

Question: Do you remove the policy or create exceptions in the by-laws?

Reply: This came about because our meetings were changed to six meetings. We have been having this discussion about retention. We even had a brief discussion about bringing young people on, or changing the time of our meetings.

Reply: How do we make this happen? Things are changing, as we take an inventory of our process this is a good opportunity.

Reply: Maybe looking at technology, doing web meetings. You have to have some accountability in place.

Reply: I get your point, we have done that. What we are doing is not being effective. We can figure out some other ways to make sure people are being held accountable.

How do we inspire people to be part of our process?

Reply: I always thought the attendance process was a little tough.

Reply: This is the last meeting of the year, what are we going to do to hold our own selves accountable.

Question: Is this a by-law or membership committee issue?

Question: How do we task this out to make sure that this happens?

Recommendation:

I recommend that we re-look at the attendance policy, at the subjective nature of the appeals process and the punitive part of the removal process.

Second:

I'll second it.

Reply: This was discussed and the body said in addition to looking at the policy the body needs to look at the recruitment process also. I think the engagement plan will make a difference to this policy.

Question: Who sits in on the appeals process?

Reply: The Executive Committee

Reply: We have a consensus for this recommendation.

Review of Attendance Sheets: No comments or changes

Review of Expenses:

Question: Do we know what the cost of the retreat is:

Reply: We will have this amount to you by the beginning of next week.

Question: For budgeting purposes, can the future cost of printing be placed under administration (ISDH)?

Reply: I don't see why not, I don't know why we stop providing materials.

Reply: I feel like maybe it was because ISDH was doing it out of their funds.

Reply: It is not coming out of the CPG budget.

Reply: You guys (ISDH) can take care of it now.

Question: So pretty much everything gets put in the folders.

Question: Can we opt out of this request?

Reply: I would think that you can, I would think that once we start making copies you would still get copies in the folders.

Question: If the State prints out the materials, would we still get the material through email?

Reply: Yes, the material would still be sent out through email.

9:30 a.m. – 9:40 a.m.

Executive Committee Report

Latorya Greene, Community Co-Chair

I want to thank everyone for coming out to the retreat and the hard work of the retreat committee members.

9:40 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Division Report/ISDH RFP/Expanded Testing

Andrea Perez, ISDH Co-Chair

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

STD Committee Presentation

Richard Nash, Chair

ISDH will provide a list to the CPG of the providers that administer the EPT.

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH

1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.

[HPG Guidance training/USCA](#)

Angela Goode

The meeting was to go through the tool (supplements the new Guidance) that was given to the attendees. The attendees then offered feedback.

1:15 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Membership Committee

Brian Revalee, Chair

Suggestions for moving forward:

Committee voted to move forward with the plan that has been presented to the full body. After discussing whether or not to select new members for recruitment a decision was made by a 3 to vote.

Question: Did you touch on how we will determine who are key stakeholders are and how we will get them around the table?

Response: We are looking at increasing the number of members on the CPG as well as the TA.

Question: Will this advisory group be under the discretion of the membership?

Reply: We will work with the Needs Assessment Committee.

Question: The advisory would be more TA?

Reply: The TA and advisory will be one group

Question: So we are looking at bringing on no one until this all gets hammered out?

Reply: Yes.

Question: How many applications have we received this year?

Reply: We received one which brought us to a total of seven applicants. Current applicants will receive a letter asking if they want to remain on the applicant list.

Question: We don't think that any of those seven can assist us now with their skill sets and talents?

Reply: There was a discussion around this; with the new Guidance we thought we needed a better process.

Reply: It needs to be objective/open. It seems like it's not open.

Reply: Our goal is to be more objective. If we went through the process now, it would be subjective. So we are putting together a process that is objective and transparent.

Reply: The full committee is going to decide to accept what has been said?

Reply: This is just the committee's suggestion.

Reply: I can see where this new process will be a benefit.

Reply: Our role has changed, to give those already at the table more time to get a hold of what is going on, we will have a much better retention in the long run.

Reply: When we are trying to orientate new people to the process, you can't really move forward where you want to be.

Reply: The rationale in moving from 25 to 20 members was the struggle to fill those seats. There's a core group who have been on board for the last 2 years. If we are functioning at that level this will be a way to meet that, "hey we are finally full". If the seats are consistently empty, why are we continually trying to fill them?

Question: Will the number of members affect the CPG budget?

Reply: If we consistently have a sustainably amount of money left every year, will the State cut the budget, probably. When we do a projected budget of the cost of CPG, and the amount of the membership is decreased and less is needed to cover the cost, why wouldn't we cut the budget?

Reply: If we lower the membership to 20 we are operating at a higher capacity. It reduces the cost of CPG, this money could be used somewhere else and be potentially beneficial somewhere else.

Reply: In reducing the membership seats, it seems that the five seats that are being taken away could be representative of priority populations. What could be dangerous is to use CPG dollars to supplement prevention dollars. These dollars have a specific mandate and it is specific to CPG. This new Guidance and HPG opens up great opportunities for the CPG to do

something different. I don't think the intent was to scrape everything that the CPG has done. It is CPG's charge to figure out what needs to be fixed or remain the same.

Reply: The Membership Committee will continue to make recommendations.

Reply: The full CPG has never received all of the full profiles but only the ones that were being recommended.

Question: Was the process flawed?

Reply: No

Question: You are reducing the at large and replacing with more targeted, haven't we doubled the numbers except Hispanic and MSN.

Reply: Yes

Reply: If in our findings through the engagement process we find that we will benefit from 25 then we can change it.

Reply: Going from 25 to 20 members has been one thing that Membership has always discussed because of the capacity issues.

Reply: Once you open that can of worms, this just gives a reason to reduce funding. To take this away is scary to me.

Reply: There is a little up time not as much as was said having orientation before the beginning of the year meeting to orientate new members about the process of the committee so that individuals are up to speed. Is it totally just filling the seats and not being able to retain them or is it those who are mandatory dropped due to attendance policy. I don't think this is going to fix it all. I believe there is an underline issue that needs to be looked at.

Reply: Two of the three members who resigned were due to new employment and were not given time off from their employers to attend CPG meetings.

Reply: Why do we keep holding seats where we have never had members or have low incidence? If we are going to work to improve the process then it makes sense to hold off on getting new members. But if we are going to engage new stakeholders and then have no seats to put them in once engaged that makes no sense.

Reply: The reduction is more administrative. The shift is to bring them on through the advisory group and have them engaged that way.

Reply: There are some things that we need to get in check within the CPG before we do a spin off. I don't agree with reducing the number of seats.

Reply: Can we get a recommendation and see what happens with it. I'm almost feeling like these need to be two separate recommendations.

Recommendation:

It was recommended that the matrix be accepted as presented.

Question: The recommendation is accepting the matrix at 20 seats?

Vote:

Six members voted to accept the matrix as presented. Five members voted against the matrix. The vote passed. A recommendation was made not to bring members on for 2013 – there was a consensus

2:00 p.m. –3:00 p.m. Committee Reports

1. Needs Assessment:

Needs Assessment had a face-to-face meeting, the minutes are in the packets. Needs Assessment and Membership will figure out when they can get together to meet.

2. Evaluation:

We will meet in the near future. We will work on redoing the survey.

3. Policy and Procedures

No new report. We will work with membership about the attendance policy

4. **Advocacy:**

Between now and the next CPG meeting we will send out talking points with specific legislature info about the Affordable Care Act. HJR6 is back up for discussion. We are looking at having a conversation around making a recommendation that Hepatitis B be added to one of the battery test for pregnant women.

Reply: We recently had someone from New Mexico visit ISDH.

Their CPG has been working with some of the pharmaceutical stores giving out handouts about the at home HIV test.

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Q & A/Old & New Business

Recertification process was very interesting. It is a new process for ISDH. Testers were given two opportunities to take and pass the test. If you didn't pass you would have to retake the 4 day State Certification class.

Question: For those who failed is there an opportunity for them to find out what areas they failed in?

Reply: There was a refresher course offered to prepare the testers for the test. For the skills piece they were made aware of the areas in which they failed.

Reply: The biggest complaint I heard was about the acronyms; that they were not specific to the testers.

Reply: I think that we tried to make sure they were HIV specific and an acronym list was sent out in advance to the testers.

Reply: The skills portion felt kind of subjective. I felt like there could have been a better scoring method.

Reply: We are going to look at all of the feedback that we get. We know we will need to make adjustments as we go along.

Question: With the skill sets why can't we just check off the skill sets at that point versus having to do it separately?

Reply: That can possibly be done. These were the bare minimum that we expected you to be able to do. We would like to do a video with our trainer doing the training the way we expect testers to do things.

Reply: Looking in the future will there be a difference in the test for prevention versus a SPSP testers?

Question: We heard that a lot, with the controls we may be more flexible, but the other piece, that is part of the training that you receive.

Reply: Refresher courses were provided that allowed testers to learn or refresh skills that were needed to pass the test.

Positive Link has a book of HIV information for health care workers. I think every region should have.

3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment

3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.

Announcements & Celebrations

Certificates were given to members for their work and support for 2012.

Both AFC presentations were very good. If you have a request for information whether it directly affects our work or not, please ask so that we can be a resource for those types of things.

AIDS Ministry's Women's Conference is December 6, 2012, the registration deadline is December 3rd. Tony Gillespie will be the keynote speaker.

**Please complete the End of the Year Survey before you leave
Next Meeting – January 15, 2013 at 10 A.M. Promptly**

Adjourn: 2:55 pm