

**Minnesota Council for HIV/AIDS Care and Prevention
Membership and Training Committee
Friday, November 19, 2021
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes**

Committee Members Present:	
Stephen Jensen (co-chair)	Tyrie Stanley
Loyal Brooks	Calvin Hillary Hylton (co-chair)
James McMurray	
Committee Members Absent:	
Amy Miller	
Guests:	
Aurin Roy, Hennepin County Ryan White (minutes)	
Hennepin County (Part A) Representative:	DHS (Part B) Representative:
Anika Kaleewoun	None
MDH (Prevention) Representative:	MCHACP Staff:
McKinzie Woelfel	Carissa Weisdorf

Quorum Present? **Yes**

I. Welcome and introductions

- Stephen Jensen called the meeting to order at 10:05am and read the guiding principles. Introductions were made.

II. Review and approval of the October 15 meeting minutes and proposed agenda

- The agenda was approved as printed.
- The minutes were approved as printed.

III. Discuss interviews

- L.L. was interviewed on November 19, 2021 by Carissa Weisdorf, Loyal Brooks, and James McMurray. Loyal Brooks said that she was very qualified, authentic, knowledgeable, and experienced, and noted that she was a strong candidate. James McMurray seconded that she was professional, passionate, and a good fit for the Council.
 - Tyrie Stanley asked about L.L.'s background. Carissa Weisdorf responded that she is not a consumer or part of a funded provider agency but fills a greater Minnesota vacancy and is a volunteer Peer Recovery Supporter with Harm Reduction Sisters (which has combined chemical and behavioral health networks). She has experience with chemical dependency outreach treatment and has a background of working in nonprofits, including outside Minnesota. She previously worked in development, and, through that, worked on a grant focused on addressing chemical dependency and reaching African American men. The grant provided for a safe space that included HIV testing, and L.L. noted

becoming interested in HIV through that work and through its intersections with substance use. Carissa Weisdorf seconded that L.L. was passionate, felt that the Council's work was important, and has enough time for the Council.

- Stephen Jensen asked about the other interview that was scheduled for this month. The interviewee was T.P. Carissa Weisdorf responded that T.P had a family emergency and will reschedule the interview.

IV. Review applications and schedule interviews

- Carissa Weisdorf noted that there are 7 new Council applications. Carissa Weisdorf displayed **MCHACP Application Form Responses** and went through each response individually.
- Carissa Weisdorf first displayed L.L. application and asked if she should be recommended to the council following her interview. Loyal Brooks said yes.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed J.O.'s application second. Loyal Brooks said that their PhD stood out as a qualification and that they should be interviewed. Loyal Brooks asked what Council vacancies they could fill, and Carissa Weisdorf responded that they fill the transgender/nonbinary consumer vacancy which the committee has tried to fill based on the request of the Disparities Elimination Committee.
- Carissa Weisdorf reviewed J.V.'s application. Stephen Jensen asked if he should be interviewed or if he could [move forward without an interview](#). Carissa Weisdorf responded that he should be interviewed because he completed his Council term over a year ago. Loyal Brooks added that it will be good to have the insight of a physician (like J.V.) on the council.
- Carissa Weisdorf reviewed S.H.'s application. Stephen Jensen asked what vacancy positions she fits. Carissa Weisdorf responded that she meets vacancies for a Black/African American position.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed S.J.'s application and noted that he would not have to be interviewed due to his current involvement on the Council. Loyal Brooks seconded that S.J. should be included on the applicant grid.
- Carissa Weisdorf went over S.B.'s application. Loyal Brooks asked about their application. Carissa Weisdorf clarified that he is white but fills the unaligned consumer and transgender vacancies.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed T.J.'s application.
- Stephen Jensen asked which members are scheduled to interview next month and Carissa Weisdorf noted Loyal Brooks and Calvin H. Hylton. She also noted that part of the December meeting time could be dedicated to multiple interviews.

V. Review projected vacancies and discuss recruitment

- Carissa Weisdorf displayed and reviewed **Projected Vacancies for Term Starting March 1, 2022**. Loyal Brooks remarked that the state Medicaid vacancy probably will not be filled. Carissa Weisdorf noted that Amy Miller said she will look into it, but other councils also have issues filling this vacancy.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed **2021.11 Pending Applications** and recommended interviewing J.O., S.B., and J.V. since they fill vacancies. Loyal Brooks agreed.

- Carissa Weisdorf brought up concerns with interviewing more women since we have so many vacancies for men. Loyal Brooks said men should be prioritized because there is a large vacancy (16 seats).
- McKinzie Woelfel suggested that the female applicants could be interviewed but also be encouraged to take a community position and keep their application on hold for future interviews. McKinzie Woelfel did not want to make a recommendation on who to interview, but also emphasized not wanting to lose any applicants who were interested.
 - Stephen Jensen asked if T.J. should be interviewed or be recommended to take a community spot. Loyal Brooks had no preference. McKinzie Woelfel recommended leaving the decision up to T.J. in the initial scheduling interview phone call. Stephen Jensen and Loyal Brooks seconded this.
 - Calvin Hillary Hylton said that there should not be this caveat because it feels disingenuous, and that applicants should just be told directly that there is not a spot for them. Tyrie Stanley seconded this. The rest of the committee agreed that T.J. and S.H. should not be interviewed and should be asked to join as a community member instead. James McMurray asked if their applications will still be kept because he outreached to both of them directly. Carissa Weisdorf clarified that their applications will still be kept on file for one year and we could revisit their applications next month depending on what additional applications we receive.
- Carissa Weisdorf noted that J.O. has been responsive to emails, but S.B. has not responded to two emails and a phone call to set up an interview.
- Loyal Brooks asked if there has been a replacement for Richard Puella. Carissa Weisdorf responded there was supposed to be a temp, but the temp became unavailable after a wrist injury. The temp agency is still looking for a replacement, so Aurin Roy has stepped in to take minutes for the month. The position was first posted as a lateral transfer, and there were no applications. Now, the application will go out as an open competitive spot. Jonathan Hanft is working on that, but HR has not yet posted the position.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed the **2020-2021 Standards of Membership** and reviewed which Council members are interested in a second term.
 - Stephen Jensen asked what the “completed paired comparisons for priority setting” standard was. It can be a not applicable standard if someone joined after the process. Loyal Brooks asked why Jo Ann Vertetis did not complete this standard of membership. Carissa Weisdorf responded that Jo Ann Vertetis had requested a hard copy and Richard Puella did send it, but there is no confirmation about whether Jo Ann Vertetis got the hard copy or sent it back.
 - Carissa Weisdorf said that it is helpful to review this document to figure out how many seats are open for the next year.
- Carissa Weisdorf presented **Potential Applicants** and reviewed which previous applications were kept on hold. Applicants were removed if they moved/left, or did not fill a current vacancy. Previous applicants can be contacted about their interest.

- Loyal Brooks offered to reach out to Alejandro Aguilera.
- Loyal Brooks noted that Cody Rogahn may be available now and asked if he had been to CVC meetings. James McMurry noted seeing Cody Rogahn at CVC but does not know when he saw him last. Stephen Jensen is willing to reach out to Cody Rogahn.

VI. **Committee assignments for new members**

- Carissa Weisdorf presented **2021.10 FY 2021 Committee Assignments** and reviewed which new members need to be assigned to committees. Tyrie Stanley asked when the new members term will start, and Carissa said December 1.
 - **MOTION:** Loyal Brooks moved to assign Angela Reed to the Needs Assessment & Evaluation Committee and Annalise Barghini to the Planning and Allocations Committee as per their top choices. Calvin Hillary Hylton seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously.

VII. **Review attendance**

- Carissa Weisdorf reviewed the **FY21 MCHACP Attendance Tracking and Council Standing** spreadsheet. There were no attendance issues for the council and the committees.

VIII. **Attendance policy discussion**

- Calvin Hillary Hylton stated that this is an informal, open forum discussion about the attendance policy, and there is space to have a more structured parliamentary-style meeting in the future.
- Stephen Jensen said that he had brought the current attendance policy to the Executive Committee and the Council for review and feedback. For the issue of proxy voting, neither the Executive Committee nor the Council liked it, so Stephen Jensen recommended we keep the current policy that we do not allow proxy voting. Loyal Brooks is also in favor of no proxy voting.
 - **MOTION:** Stephen Jensen moved to preserve the no proxy voting rule in further discussions of the redesign of the attendance policy. Loyal Brooks seconded the motion.
 - James McMurray asked whether someone could send a representative on their behalf to a meeting if the no proxy rule is preserved. Calvin Hillary Hylton responded no.
 - Tyrie Stanley asked about the purpose of this motion given that no proxy voting is already present in the current attendance policy. Calvin Hillary Hylton clarified that the motion is needed because the attendance policy is being redesigned altogether. McKinzie Woelfel also found this motion confusing.
 - **Motion passes 3-1.**
 - James McMurray clarified that he was in favor of a policy that allowed a co-chair to present another co-chairs thoughts at a meeting if one of them could not attend.

- Carissa displayed the **Attendance Policy and Proxy Voting Handout**. Calvin Hillary Hylton opened the floor for questions about amendment ideas.
- Tyrie Stanley is not in favor of the current policy because it creates a loophole for government representatives. Tyrie Stanley is also not in favor of the leave of absence revision. Loyal Brooks clarified that the leave of absence is more about communication and was created in response to previous issues of dismissing people from the council who want to participate. This revision will ensure that people must communicate in advance when they are unable to attend a meeting.
- McKinzie Woelfel agreed that the leave of absence is about communication as well, but added that it goes beyond holding government representatives accountable. It is also a way of supporting people who may be experiencing life difficulties. There also is a difference between government representatives who attend as council members vs. those who attend as resources, and someone who is there as a resource can send someone in their place.
- Tyrie Stanley said that this leave of absence policy would give people 2 more extra absences, and that this is not fair for people who are at the council full time. Stephen Jensen agrees that 8 absences are too many, but also asked Carissa Weisdorf if there has ever been a written notice that a council member will be absent. Carissa Weisdorf responded yes. Stephen Jensen voiced concerns that people may have valid reasons for being absent, like death in the family, and thinks that there should be flexibility in the attendance policy to accommodate that.
- Loyal Brooks clarified that this policy is not giving people 8 absences; it is still giving people 6 absences, but now forcing people to communicate when they do have to take an absence so that they are not dismissed over the existing 6 absences policy.
- Carissa Weisdorf noted that it has been her experience that the most common reason why people are close to being dismissed is because they missed 2 meetings in a row and therefore had to make the third meeting. There have not been many issues of people missing 6 meetings in a year. Since 2016, not many people have been removed for absences, but this has increased in the past year, and people have resigned for attendance reasons because of challenges around COVID-19 and adjusting to virtual meetings. This leave of absence revision alleviates stress for people who are told that they must attend the next meeting to avoid being dismissed.
- Loyal Brooks seconded this and said that there should be a policy of maximum 6 absences/year and maximum 2 absences in a row, but there should be a leave of absence policy so that people have the responsibility to communicate when they will be absent.
- Calvin Hillary Hylton said that there needs to be more equity and parity in how different types of members are treated. There should be a structure that recognizes absences as either excused or unexcused.

- Tyrie Stanley responded that this leave of absence policy is not fixing attendance issues and is instead helping people accrue more absences. People need to be held accountable and manage their own attendance.
- Calvin Hillary Hylton passed chairing to Stephen Jensen in order to participate in the discussion.
 - Calvin Hillary Hylton said there needs to be a way to accommodate people. Otherwise, attendance policies will be too rigid and will not allow the Council to accomplish its goals. Now is the opportunity to create a more flexible but accountable system. Despite what is done with respect to the leave of absence revision, there should be a system that distinguishes between excused vs. unexcused absences so that people are encouraged to participate. A rigid approach to attendance will turn people away from the Council.
- Tyrie Stanley compared being on the Council to having a job and voiced that taking extra leave would be inappropriate. This would not fix attendance issues, but rather enable it. Tyrie Stanley likes the current attendance policy but wants to make sure that it is fair and applies to everyone equally.
- Loyal Brooks gave a theoretical example of someone who missed 2 meetings but had a sudden emergency come up on the third meeting and be unable to attend. Under the current policy, the person would be removed from the Council with no exceptions. Loyal Brooks does not like this and thinks there should be flexibility, especially with a volunteer position.
- McKinzie Woelfel agrees with Tyrie Stanley that 8 absences are too much, and agrees with Calvin Hillary Hylton's proposition of having excused vs. unexcused absences. It may be good to incorporate excused or unexcused absences into the current policy. That way, if someone has 3 unexcused absences, they should be removed, but someone has excused absences, they can stay on. The current policy does work, but it is too rigid, and there should also be equality for members who represent the government agencies.
- Tyrie Stanley agrees with distinguishing between excused vs. unexcused absences but does not like the language around the leave of absence policy. The committee should look into other council attendance policies as well.
- Stephen Jensen passed chairing back to Calvin Hillary Hylton. Calvin Hillary Hylton asked if anybody had any concrete ideas on how to move forward. There were none.
- Calvin Hillary Hylton asked if the committee would prefer that some people draft an attendance policy based on these comments and then bring it back to the whole committee, or if people want to collaboratively draft a revision instead.
- Tyrie Stanley asked when bylaws are reviewed. Carissa Weisdorf said summer 2022. If this policy is time sensitive, it can be moved forward, or it can be wrapped into the next bylaw review. Tyrie Stanley wants to keep working on this until there is internal consensus before it is moved to anybody.
- Loyal Brooks asked what attendance policy people should be held to until the redrafting and voiced that people should not be kicked off the council for an

emergency absence. Carissa Weisdorf said current bylaws must be followed until there is an official bylaw amendment.

- Calvin Hillary Hylton asked if anyone is interested in drafting a policy. Tyrie Stanley said to refer to Pat Reymann, the parliamentarian, because it takes 2-3 months to get a bylaw changed. Carissa Weisdorf recommended to get Pat's input on in-between bylaw changes, because, as a best practice, bylaws should be regularly reviewed.
- Carissa Weisdorf displayed the **2021.02.09 MCHACP Bylaws** and reviewed the bylaw amendment policy. There is a 2-month timeline to make any changes.
- Calvin Hillary Hylton asked when the December meeting was. Carissa Weisdorf said December 17. Calvin Hillary Hylton proposed that a notice could be given for revision in December in order to push the revision along in January. Carissa Weisdorf clarified that the notice has to be agreed upon before it can be sent out. Furthermore, the December notice is sent on the 7th, which is before the M&T meeting for that month. Calvin Hillary Hylton responded that, if people were willing to work on the policy language, it could be possible to have a draft for the Executive Committee for review, and that could get the ball rolling.
 - Tyrie Stanley responded that this process cannot be rushed. Calvin Hillary Hylton clarified that this is not rushing the process, but rather getting something for the Executive Committee to start reviewing and considering.
- Carissa Weisdorf said that there have been many discussions about the attendance policy and that it has been changed to be more lenient. The revisions should not be rushed, and M&T should first carefully think about what the new policies should be. In the past, people were hesitant about distinguishing between excused vs. unexcused absences. It could be hard to get a final revision put together in the next 2 weeks, but if people want to draft a sample of what a new attendance policy could look like, that would be helpful.
 - McKinzie Woelfel offered to help wordsmith the attendance policy.
- Tyrie Stanley asked if it would be feasible to ask the Executive Committee to create an ad hoc committee for revising the attendance policy. Carissa Weisdorf displayed the **2021.02.09 MCHACP Bylaws** and reviewed the section on how to create an ad hoc committee.
 - Calvin Hillary Hylton said that an ad hoc committee is not a bad idea, but it would drag the process beyond the June bylaw review. It is already M&T's responsibility to deal with attendance issues, so a group of people within the committee should work on the language around the attendance policy.
 - Loyal Brooks asked for clarification about what will be done. Calvin provided clarification and added that the whole Council will get the opportunity to amend the policy as needed anyway, so the ad hoc committee will not bring anything new to the table.
- Tyrie Stanley reminded that committee that it was past the meeting time and that this discussion should be tabled.

- Carissa Weisdorf asked Stephen Jensen about notes that were taken from the Executive Committee and Council meetings about the attendance policy and suggested that those notes be distributed to the whole committee.

IX. Unfinished business / New Business

- The attendance policy discussion was tabled.

X. Agenda for the next meeting

- Carissa Weisdorf reviewed the ***FY 2021 M&T Workplan***. Part of the December meeting time may be used for conducting interviewed. Loyal Brooks and Stephen Jensen offered to assist with interviews.
- The attendance policy discussion was added to the December meeting agenda.

XI. Announcements

- No announcements were made because of time constraints.

XII. Adjourn

- Calvin Hillary Hylton adjourned the meeting at 12:07pm.

Meeting Summary

- The Council member interviews were discussed.
- All of the pending applications were discussed, and the projected Council vacancies were reviewed. Based on that, decisions were made about which applicants to interview from both the pending applicant pool and from past applications that were kept on hold.
- A motion to assign Annalise Barghini to PAC and Angela Reed to NAE was passed.
- Council member attendance was reviewed and there were no major attendance issues.
- There was a lengthy discussion about the current attendance policy and the leave of absence revision. A motion to keep the current no proxy voting policy was passed. There was no conclusive decision made about the leave of absence revision, so the next step will be for a few committee members to draft new revisions.
- Potential action items for the next meeting agenda were added to the workplan.

Documents distributed before the meeting:

- Proposed agenda
- Minutes from the October 15 meeting
- Attendance Policy and Proxy Voting Handout
- FY 2021 M&T Workplan

Documents displayed during the meeting:

- MCHACP Application Form Responses
- Projected Vacancies for Term Starting March 1, 2022.
- 2021.11 Pending Applications
- 2020-2021 Standards of Membership
- Potential Applicants

- 2021.10 FY 2021 Committee Assignments
- FY21 MCHACP Attendance Tracking and Council Standing
- 2021.02.09 MCHACP Bylaws

AR/cw