

Cuyahoga Regional HIV Prevention and Care Planning Council

Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina Counties

Billy Gayheart, Jr. Chair



Membership, Retention and Marketing (MRM) Minutes

Wednesday, June 5, 2024

2:30 am to 3:30 pm

Start: 2:35 pm

End: 3:30 pm

Facilitator: B. Gayheart

Moment of Reflection

Welcome and Introductions

Approval of Agenda: June 5, 2024

Addendum:

Motion: K. Dennis Seconded: J. Toombs

Vote: In Favor: All Opposed: 0 Abstained: 0

Approval of the Minutes: May 1, 2024

Addendum:

Motion: K. Dennis Seconded: C. Nicholls

Vote: In Favor: 6 Opposed: 0 Abstained: 1- M. Deighan

Open Nominations

Review Reflectiveness Considerations – B. Gayheart

According to HRSA (Health Services Resources Administration), the reflectiveness, or how our Planning Council membership is made up, must reflect a certain percentage of people living with HIV (PLWH) in our TGA (Transitional Grant Area) in order for our designated area to receive Ryan White funding. Additionally, the biggest mandate in meeting those requirements is that 33% of our Planning Council must consist of persons living with HIV, who may receive Part A services, but are not affiliated (work for, contract with etc.), the Part A Ryan White recipient office.

To give an overall update/review on where we are, last month we had our Executive Committee meeting and stated talks about conflicts of interest. However, the discussion did not fully extend during that meeting, so a special executive committee session was requested. It was during this session that a conversation arose about conflict of interest regarding employees of CCBH (Cuyahoga County Board of Health) and whether or not they can be voting members of Planning Council. In the end, a motion was presented and passed by the Executive Council, recommending Planning Council will follow HRSA rules in that no staff member of the Part A Recipient Office (CCBH), present or future, can be a voting member of Planning Council. In addition, due to potential conflicts of interest, the pending application in question must be declined.

As reflectiveness is required by HRSA, it is our duty as a planning to maintain adequate representation or reflectiveness of the demographic that we serve. In our case, we are a six county jurisdiction, Medina, Lorain, Cuyahoga, Lake Geauga, and Ashtabula. Our Planning Council has certain requirements and one of the biggest requirements is we have to have at least 33% unaffiliated consumers, or 33% of our members must be people living with HIV who receive Part A services but are not affiliated with them. Consequently, someone affiliated with Part A is a person who work for Part A, or that is a board member or volunteer for 20 hours or more per week. However, if you are a client of Part A, there is no conflict in

Cuyahoga Regional HIV Prevention and Care Planning Council

Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina Counties

Billy Gayheart, Jr. Chair



that. Basically, you are conflicted if you are part of a network agency that receives Ryan White Part A funding, or you work as a staff, volunteer or board member. Additionally, if this requirement is not met, we have the risk of possibly losing our grant.

In reviewing the remaining four (4) applicants, two of them are people living with HIV, and are also affiliated with a Part A organization. Therefore, we have to keep that in mind when we add members to planning council, looking at where we are now with the four applicants, that changes the 33% mark to 43%. Additionally, if we accept one, we will drop down to 41%, if we accept two, we will drop down to 39%, for three we will be at 38%, and if we accept all four, we will be at 36%, which is 3% being dangerously low. As a note, another member just resigned effectively yesterday, as he was part of that 33%.

***Question: C. Droster** - What is the difference between 38% and 39%, in terms of people.

***Response: B. Gayheart** - If we approve one of the applicants we now have, we drop to 41%, which is in relation to the unaffiliated consumers.

***Comment: T. Mahdi** – Would being conflicted and a PLWH cause more conflict in being a member?

***Response: L.J. Sylvia**- This can be brought back to discussion in MRM committee if need.

***Comment: K. Dennis** – On the commitment side, we want people on PC, but just not sure how low we can go and still have wiggle room to maintain compliance.

***Comment: L.J. Sylvia** - This issue is about the reflectiveness number, not the applicants, as that hasn't been discussed on the interview results.

***Comment: C. Droster** - Would rather be higher than lower, in going with one or two.

***Question: M. Deighan** – Is it because of the four applicants, not enough are unaffiliated consumers?

***Response: B. Gayheart** - Yes, and they are not all PLWH. The main thing we need is unaffiliated consumers, as we have to stay mindful on what HRSA requires for reflectiveness, while at the same time work to maintain a seamless, consistent membership roster. This would eliminate us having to recruit, remove, and/or fill gaps, not using the best practices, and could affect our grant.

***Comment: B. Gayheart** – There a question on raising the cap on our membership, as we would need 20 members to do this.

***Question: M. Deighan** - Are term limits given by HRSA?

***Response: B. Gayheart** - Yes, and we must have them in our bylaws.

***Response: L.J. Sylvia** - Term limits were implemented in 2017, and now is the first time we're looking at them and figuring this out. The reason for this is to make sure we have a healthy balance in PC, we just have to live in what the term limits are now.

Review and Vote on Interview Results - B. Gayheart

In learning about reflectiveness, we now want to look at how to proceed with the four applicants.

L.J. Sylvia – For the four (4) applicants, the committee can now decide whether to vote yes or no, based on reflectiveness or on their qualifications, or vote to let the Executive Committee decide the number of candidates that will be chosen.

Review and Vote on Interview Results

Motion: To table the recommendation discussion of the four (4) new applicants: C. Brady, T. Mahdi, X. Merced, and S. Rivera until the August 21, 2024 MRM meeting.

Cuyahoga Regional HIV Prevention and Care Planning Council

Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina Counties

Billy Gayheart, Jr. Chair



Motion: K. Dennis Seconded: C. Nicholls
 Vote: In Favor: All Opposed: 0 Abstained: 0
Motion passed.

Parking Lot - None

Announcements

B. Gayheart – The next meeting will on a new date and time, the third Wednesday, August 21, 2024 from 4-5:00 pm.

Adjournment

Motion: K. Dennis **Seconded:** C. Nicholls

Attendance

	MRM Members	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June PSRA	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
1	Billy Gayheart, Chair	20	20	20	20	20	20				
2	Joye Toombs	0	20	20	20	20	20				
3	Kimberlin Dennis	10	0	0	10	10	10				
4	Naimah O’Neal	10	10	0	10	10	0				
5	Jeannie Citerman-Kraeger	10	10	0	0	0	0				
6	Clinton Droster	10	0	10	10	10	10				
7	Jason McMinn	10	10	10	10	10	0				
	Total in Attendance	6	6	4	6	6	4				

PC Members: C. Nicholls, C. Brady, M. Deighan, D. Houston, T. Mahdi

Attendees: J. Garcia

Staff: M. Baker, Z. Levar, L.J. Sylvia, T. Mallory