

Item	Details	Who	Time
Hello, how are you?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Привет, как ты (Russian) Introductions – Welcome to the workgroup meeting! Chryssie, Andy, Sirry, Carissa, Jonathan, Brett, Amy No community members in attendance 	All	1:00pm (5)
Minutes Rock Star	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brett Burnham to review On deck is Andy Ansell 		
Housekeeping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 11th meeting date change – look for an email Chryssie and Krissie and Nick will not attend (Heartland conference happening then) 		
Guests joining to listen	<p>Friendly reminders (our first open meeting and Sirry's last meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We're glad you're here to listen and check out the meeting Meeting is 1pm to 2:30pm 2:20 – 2:30pm is open forum Please hold your comments, suggestions & questions until 2:20pm Each person will have 2 minutes during open forum Help yourself to copies of the agenda or other documents Thank you for your cooperation 	Amy	1:05pm (10)
New planning body	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name chosen—(Minnesota Council for HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care) call it “the Council” (Alejandro is the winner of the naming contest) An email to PC and CCCHAP was sent to inform of the new name The new name was shared on the website Membership selection committee flyer will be sent out in a few weeks 	Carissa	1:15 (5)
Bylaws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Update Sirry—we went through the comments we received from Jared, Hank and Japhete 06/25 meeting feedback was incorporated whenever possible Mostly just additional clarification was added We have not clarified having a Part A grantee on the Council with Conflict of Interest Jonathan—would this same conflict of interest exist for Part B? Sirry—likely, yes Jonathan—how do we declare conflict of interest (CI)? Andy—we are grantees, do we really need to disclose CI? Jonathan—Let's ask our project officer about how to address this? PC is not supposed to have anything to do with the selection of providers, grantee staff on the PC will be involved with selecting providers, so there is CI there. It makes most sense to have all Grantee staff represented on the Council Andy—will Part B have the same criterion for CI as Part A? Jonathan—DHS is usually seen as a good CI Jonathan—action step, follow up with project officer about CI concerns Sirry—CI should be clarified 	Chryssie	1:20 (20)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andy—what is the Membership Selection process for Grantee staff? i.e. self-appoint, or an application/vetting process? • Amy—does wording need to be added to the bylaws “as appointed by the grantees?” • All—no • An application and interview process is required • 3 grantee staff will be on the membership selection committee, and these grantee slots must be filled • The bylaws are ready, we will all review them • The workgroup will review the bylaws via bringing feedback • In August the Structure Committee will review the full edited bylaws • Then legal review of the bylaws will be done by HC • Amy—MDH and DHS are doing an in-house review, but this is not required; DHS administration will review the bylaws and approve • Andy—the IGA will be reviewed by DHS • Carissa—are we giving the bylaws to any other council for review? • Jonathan—we will provide feedback to PC & CCCHAP on the approved bylaws • Amy—for transparency, we need to share bylaws feedback at the integrated planning update, where we note changes, etc. We can communicate that once the new planning body is established, the bylaws are up for change • Carissa—we’ve received feedback, incorporated feedback, had the bylaws reviewed by legal, and will then share with the PC and CCCHAP • Jonathan—we should include language that unaligned consumers are given preference • Amy—sticky widgets (these are the changes we made, and this is why) • Carissa—create a document of things that were changed to share; we should note that we did receive contradictory feedback • Provide the 06/25 bylaws feedback on the website • Jonathan—use language “we used the feedback to develop the bylaws” • Edit the 06/25 bylaws notes and put that on Basecamp 		
IGA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status update • Jonathan—checked in with the attorney, has not heard back from her yet (he was sent the IGA during the meeting) • Jonathan will send the feedback to MDH and DHS grantees (Nick and Andy; Chrissy and Krissie) • Amy—does the IGA need to be signed by all parties before being sent to Ramsey County, etc. • Jonathan—no, Hennepin County is the last to sign • Chrissy—at MDH Krissie needs to sign it 	Jonathan	1:40 (5)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last IGA is on Basecamp • Amy—some wording in the bylaws could influence the IGA? • Jonathan—no 		
<p>Structure Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update • We have 5 committees similar to the PC (Executive, Planning and Priorities, Membership and Training, Needs Assessment, Community Voices) • We did not come to a consensus about a disparities committee • Our next meeting is on Monday the 3rd where we will establish the responsibilities of the committees and also the existence of a disparities committee • Prevention will be integrated across all of these committees • HC will develop the new comprehensive care and prevention plan, which will be brought to the Planning and Priorities Committee for consideration • Sirry—is it OK for those who have little HIV/AIDS experience to run as a co-chair for a committee? We want an understanding of community planning and Ryan White. We need to establish co-chair requirements (for committees and PC co-chairs) • Jonathan—within so many months of appointment, we want to facilitate co-chair training • Next Steps—determine co-chair criteria (CCCHAP and PC folks pair up, etc.) 	<p>Sirry</p>	<p>1:45 (10)</p>
<p>Membership Selection Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update • Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Email message created, Per KG – brief 2 to 3 sentences that describes what “Council” is going to do ○ Amy and Diane joined ○ Diane will set agendas and help facilitate as a neutral party ○ A new timeline is posted on basecamp for this process ○ The application is complete—everything will be finalized by August 11th for distribution ○ We will send out the application to all of our lists and ask them to share this with their networks ○ If we have deficiencies in categories for applicants (i.e. the mental health slot), we will target efforts outside of our contacts; we don’t want to put this out to public listserves ○ We will assess the application pool one month after roll-out ○ The interview questions are being edited by Chrissy ○ Mental health and Medicaid = deficiencies for PC ○ Faith based, corrections and HIV+ persons = deficiencies for CCCHAP ○ Amy has Corrections contacts that we could utilize ○ Any knows discharge case managers that we can distribute applications to 	<p>Carissa</p>	<p>1:55 (10)</p>

<p>Integrated Work Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will create a flyer for recruitment of applicants ● Added determine meeting schedules ● The Structure Committee kicked-backed time-tables for meeting ● Jonathan—each committee sets their schedule ● Sirry—a proposal was sent to have to Council meet every-other-month, which will not work ● Jonathan—who determines both PC and CCCHAP meeting schedules? CCCHAP Executive Committee sets the meeting schedule, and Committees set their own schedule ● We want to establish an expectation of members for time commitments to meet (6-8 hours per month) ● Andy—We can cancel meetings if need be ● Amy—Krissie needs to be at the table to make this decision ● CCCHAP only meets quarterly ● Jonathan—Part A needs to meet every month. There are very strict penalties for not spending funds, and the Council needs to make quick decision of allocations, which requires meeting monthly ● When we all get back together, we will re-discuss this issue ● Andy—we often do cancel 1 or 2 PC meetings per year ● 3.6 and 3.8 in the workplan file <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other questions highlighted in pink on the workplan handout Look at workplan—on page 2, things in pink need clarity ○ No MOU’s, we need charters ○ Grantee responsibilities; Planning Body Responsibilities, Joint Responsibilities, grantee support conflict resolution ○ We may be able to create a Charter template and use the MOU’s to fill it in (we need a draft of this in January) ○ We can post Part A & B MOU’s on Basecamp ○ Jonathan will post a charter template on Basecamp; Jonathan will be the lead on this ○ 3.12—budget, Nick needs to be a part of this, Krissie needs this ASAP, the MDH budget proposal is due on August 27th (set up a meeting with Jonathan to meet this deadline) ○ 3.13 Outcomes—how do we feel about this ○ Is the Council accomplishing what it needs to accomplish (we need to address this with 3.13 at a later time) ○ 5.0 Brett will work on an evaluation ○ 6.0 parking lot issues can be addressed now before the new planning body convenes ○ The January 2016 meeting will be a new member orientation potentially ○ Jonathan—4.3—should we ADD a 4.2 that says “preparation for new planning body meeting in January” 	<p>Amy</p>	<p>2:05 (15)</p>
-----------------------------	---	------------	----------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3.16 and 3.27 is about the ending of business for the PC and CCCHAP (we can ask executive how they'd like us to do this) 		
Summary Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What are our accomplishments during our meeting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st; 2nd; 3rd; 4th ○ IGA is here ○ Membership selection process almost done ○ Bylaws ○ Updated workplan ○ 06/25 bylaws note shares ○ Jonathan is the point person for the Charter ○ Sirry's last meeting ● Gut Check 	All	2:20 (5)
Open Forum	<p>GOODBYE SIRRY! We are losing a very important resource—this will be hard without Sirry</p>	open	2:25 (10)
End			2:35
Next Meeting:	Due to NASTAD conference; 8/11 meeting is changing		