

**RYAN WHITE CARE COUNCIL
PLANNING AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
PARK STATION
TUESDAY JULY 18, 2006
10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.**

MINUTES

- CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Jim McGarvey at 10:03 a.m.
- ATTENDANCE** Members Present: Vivian Candelaria, Marie Dolphin, Barb Green, James McGarvey, John Melartin, Bob Reynolds, Jim Roth.
Members Absent: Elizabeth Bailey, Lisa Cohen, Lee Luther, Mark Mischan, Deborah Robinson, William Wilbanks, Jr.
Guests Present: Erin Demery, Hope Johnson, Vicky Oliver, Andrew Paquette.
Staff Present: Allison Gibbons, Collette Tomberlin.
- CHANGES TO AGENDA** There were no changes to the agenda.
- CORRECTION TO THE MINUTES** Vivian noted that the county mentioned on page 2, under the heading 'Announcements' (paragraph 4, line 4), should be changed from Pasco to Hillsborough.
- ADOPTION OF MINUTES** The minutes for June 20 were adopted (M: Candelaria, S: Green) with 7 yes votes, 0 no votes.
- CARE COUNCIL REPORT** Jim McGarvey reported on the following highlights from the July Care Council meeting --- Dave Konnerth was elected as the new Vice Chair; a slate of new members was accepted; RPARC passed the re-allocation of Title I and Title II Funds; the draft Medication Formulary was approved, but still open to exceptions and further analysis, with utilization data to be considered; members voted on the two by-law revisions: (1) - only new Care Council members would be interviewed prior to beginning a new term of service (2) - members who have served out their term limits on the Care Council will be able to again offer themselves for a position on the Care Council after sitting out for one year; an announcement was also made that Medicaid was now covering vision care.
- COMMUNITY INPUT SESSION RESPONSES** Members received a report on the community input groups from January and February 2006. Jim McGarvey brought members up to date that four community groups were convened, yet only one meeting resulted in usable input. The session had been part of the Rural Issues Committee regular meeting. Members expressed their understanding

of the reasons why people were conflicted about responding to questions that were linked to a possible loss of services. Jim M pointed out that the issue spoke directly to eligibility criteria, the subject of their current ad hoc sub committee. After members reviewed the report, John Melartin moved to put the information on file for future reference. The motion was accepted unanimously.

UNMET NEED SURVEY

Allison shared a written status report on the Unmet Needs Survey. An analysis of documents on file had revealed that a workable methodology for primary data collection had not been found. A survey at Williams Park for World AIDS Day had been approved by the Committee, but the implementation met with difficulties. No other activity had taken place.

Allison and Collette introduced information on upcoming Technical Assistance on Unmet Needs Methodology provided by MOSAICA under contract with HRSA sometime during the current quarter. The Grantee, Ryan White staff as well as P&E committee members will be invited. A date will be announced.

Members agreed that tasks under Objective 2D of P&E Work Plan, which address data collection from PLWHA individuals, can be delayed contingent upon the MOSAICA training. Methodology for both the primary and secondary data collection can be determined after the training. Staff will continue to work on Objective 2C. Task 2 of this objective was completed when the Epidemiology Report was presented and accepted at P&E Committee meeting in April 2006.

2006 NEEDS ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

Collette referred to a one-page document made available to members regarding the Needs Assessment Schedule. Copies of a supporting chart on Elements of Needs Assessment were also distributed. Elements in the Needs Assessment were the Epidemiologic Profile and the Funding Stream Analysis. Current contract year components are the Unmet Need (methodology to be determined), Resource Analysis and Client Focus Groups. The work plan for the Needs Assessment was agreed to by consensus.

There was general discussion on the Resource Analysis regarding complications involved when providers collected and reported on data differently based on the requirements of their funders. Members acknowledged that much of this data is available online on organizations' websites and official County websites and that there was no need to re-invent the wheel.

On the topic of Client Focus Groups, staff suggested collaboration with other agencies that were convening client groups for various purposes. Vivian offered collaboration with the Tampa housing group. Hope mentioned that the current Metro project may also be a source for client

groups. Marie suggested that personnel at the USF Honors Program be approached for potential research collaboration. Jim M proposed that staff examine the scripts used for past focus groups to glean ideas for the sessions. The group agreed with Jim that a choice be made on the targeted clients taking into account the data gaps from the most recent client survey.

REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE

Members each received a copy of the minutes of the ad hoc meeting on eligibility criteria. Jim M shared a synopsis of the minutes. The motion from the ad hoc committee was presented to the meeting –

Motion 07/06-01: THAT THERE SHOULD BE ALIGNMENT OF TITLE I WITH TITLE II ASSET AND INCOME LIMITS. GRADUALLY IMPLEMENT WITH RFAS AS THEY GO OUT IN THE FALL OF 2006, WITH FULL IMPLEMENTATION BY MARCH 2007 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007.

The motion was open for discussion. Members examined issues of standards, fairness, interpretation and difficulties in applying rules of eligibility against a background of flat funding. Barb urged what is best for the community. Andrew stressed that more time is needed to make a decision that affects so many. John asked for further clarification on defining Eligibility vs. Qualifications. The Chair summarized that it seemed the group did not wish to make a rush to judgment and asked the members to come up with what might be the best decision for the time being. The following motion passed (M: Reynolds, S: Green) with 6 YES votes and one (1) NO vote:

MOTION 07/06-01

REVOKE THE MOTION FROM THE AD HOC GROUP.

Members agreed to keep the topic of eligibility criteria on the agenda on a continuous basis in order to continue the discussion. Various services will be examined to see how individual service categories will be affected by alignment of Title I with Title II criteria.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Bob mentioned that the PWA Coalition was holding a special meeting on July 25 to discuss ways to avoid the probability of the Coalition being disbanded. Unless there is some intervention, the regular scheduled meeting on August 1 would be the final one.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There will not be a meeting of the Care Council in August. The next meeting of the Care Council will be on the first Wednesday in September. New member orientation will be held on August 2 & 3.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning and

Evaluation Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.