

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
San Francisco Leadership Initiative (SFLI)
Thursday, October 26, 2006

MINUTES

Members Present: Isela Gonzalez, Frank Strona, Rakli Wilburn, David Weinman, Bernie Berger, Tom Kennedy, Naishin Fu, Tei Okamoto, Erik Dubon (HPS)

Members Absent: Jennifer Awa, Walter Chang, Koji Sakakibara, Perry Rhodes III

Professional Staff: Eileen Loughran (HPS), Israel Nieves-Rivera (HPS), Aimee Crisostomo (Harder & Co/notetaker)

1. Welcome and Announcements

Co-chairs, Tom Kennedy and Isela Gonzalez, opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Approval of 9/28/2006 Minutes (vote)

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes.

4. Committee Business

• **Steering Update (written report)**

- The Steering committee reviewed the attendance of members for the HPPC and the committees. The group determined who is in need of a courtesy letter informing them of their absences.
- The group reviewed the agenda for the October council meeting.
- The Steering committee began a discussion on the CDC recommendations for testing but the committee agreed to continue this discussion at a future meeting since it was not on the agenda.
- The September council meeting was debriefed. The committee concluded that there were too many presentations (Forensic AIDS Project and Albert Liu). The group agreed that more time should have been allotted for discussion. The planning unit acknowledged that suggestion and will develop future agendas accordingly.

5. Debrief 11/12 HPPC meeting (possible vote)

◆ Finalize Recommendations

Committee members were informed that their recommendations were approved by the HPPC on 10/12 with some amendments. Aimee (Harder+Co.) reviewed the amendments to SFLI's document, "Our Vision of HIV Prevention in San Francisco in 2007 and Beyond", from the council meeting.

◆ Debrief 11/12 HPPC meeting

Co-chairs thanked Frank Strona and Bernie Berger for presenting the committee's work at the 10/12 HPPC meeting. Committee members were asked to provide feedback and share their thoughts on how they thought the presentation went. Committee members touched on the following areas:

A Challenging Topic to Present

The group discussed how they had a unique challenge to present a large vision to an audience who may be used to looking at the micro level. Frank suggested that the committee took on topics that may have been construed as ignoring the givens such as the priority populations determined by BRPs. During the presentation, these "givens" should have been acknowledged clearly.

Israel suggested that it may have been helpful to provide a frame for leadership and how the committee is building upon it. For example, council members questioned SFLI's decision to focus on perinatal transmission. Although not a BRP, it is still important address this issue in order to end perinatal transmission. In approaching the work of the SFLI, council members may have gone from planners to providers and forgot the larger vision. The group concurred with Frank adding that council members with the most questions where those not involved in planning the leadership. He noted that it might have been helpful to frame the committee's presentation with a historical context of SFLI and the HIV Prevention Plan. The group agreed that it is important to remember that this committee was not working out of context of the plan.

Eileen added that this committee grappled for many months with visions at both the macro and micro levels. She reminded the committee that introducing these concepts to the larger council in twenty-five minutes was a huge challenge. The group acknowledged that they started off with a scope of work that was difficult and broad.

Inconsistency Between Slide & Handout

Frank noted that some confusion from the council may have stemmed from the inconsistencies between one slide and the handout.

Coordinating Between Two Committees

Overall, the committee agreed that coordinating with Strategies & Interventions (S&I) made the process more confusing. Frank recalled that he thought that S&I's presentation would discuss the specific examples of structural interventions (referred to as the "bullet points") which the SFLI committee had adopted as part of its' vision statements. Other members agreed that the bullet points were never clear. One member suggested that having both committees make one large presentation may have been better.

Additionally, it was suggested that one of the co-chairs of the committees should have framed the two presentations and that there should have been more framing around leadership and what that meant.

Respect for the Rules of Engagement

Some committee members shared their frustration with persons who spoke with combative tones; and persons who did not respect the "one question" rule. One member noted that the person who asked a lot of questions of the committee was late to the meeting and may not have heard Clare Nolan's talking points that framed the two presentations from SFLI and Strategies & Interventions. Eileen noted that HPS staff is working on a way to ensure that both council members and the public respect the rules of engagement. The group agreed that it is important to strategize about how to talk to "obstructionists" at council meetings. Bernie added that he received two apologies from people after the presentation.

Clarity of Motions

David Weinman was concerned that not everyone knows what motion was passed. He added that the committee forgot that certain words have different meanings. For example, "Priorities" have different meaning for different people and groups, and often, people think about BRPs and funding. He suggested that the committee should have used the phrase, "Areas of Leadership" instead of "Priorities". Rakli mentioned that it may have been a good idea to break down the motions.

Keeping Steering and Council Informed on Committee Work

The group agreed that in order to keep the council informed on a committee's work and to obtain ongoing feedback, committees should provide mid-year updates to Steering. This way, committees can obtain suggestions about the direction of their work and council members are apprised of the topics/issues that they will be asked to vote on during end-of-year presentations.

David added that the committees need to be mindful of the actual amount of time that they have to conduct work. He noted the committee did not meet until February. He said that it was miraculous that the committee got as far as it did.

Final Thoughts

Overall, the presenters felt supported by fellow committee members during the council meeting. Committee members were very appreciative of the presenters and felt good about their work for the year.

◆ **Next steps**

Israel reminded committee members that either HPS staff or Steering Committee will take on the next steps in regards to SFLI's recommendations. The group agreed to adjourn the committee this month. The group will not meet in November or December.

6. Closing

Co-chairs reminded the committee to complete the Zoomerang survey and to share their overall thoughts about their experience on the committee this year.

These minutes were prepared by Aimee Crisostomo and reviewed by Eileen Loughran, Isela Gonzalez, and Tom Kennedy.

This is the committee's last meeting. The group will not meet in November or December.