

Planning and Allocations Committee
Wednesday, September 28, 2022
9:30 – 11:00 a.m.
Microsoft Teams Meeting
Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:	
Nyonbeor Boley	Larry McPherson (co-chair)
Annalise Jackson	Doug Peterson
Florence Kulubya-Nabeta	Tyrie Stanley (co-chair)
Mary McCarthy	
Committee Members Absent:	
None	
Guests:	
Josh Stillwell, Hennepin County	
Hennepin County (Part A) Representative:	DHS (Part B) Representative:
None	Thomas Blissett
MDH (Prevention) Representative:	MCHACP Staff:
McKinzie Woelfel	Bryan Bick, Administrative Specialist (minutes)

Quorum? Yes

- I. **Welcome and introductions:** Tyrie Stanley called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. Introductions were made.

- II. **Review and approval of July 27 minutes and proposed agenda**
 - The July 27 minutes were reviewed and approved as printed.
 - The proposed agenda was reviewed and approved as printed.

- III. **Review results of priority setting and resource allocation evaluations and debrief process:** Bryan Bick displayed **Results of 2022 PSRA Evaluation**.
 - A committee member asked about a better process to get input from the Community Voices Committee (CVC) for priority setting and resource allocation (PSRA).
 - This has been identified as a concern by the Planning and Allocations Committee and by CVC.
 - Bryan Bick explained that the co-chairs of CVC felt it would be difficult to engage their committee in conversations about resource allocation because many of the members attend for one meeting and don't receive the necessary background information.
 - Bryan suggested starting the process of gathering feedback from CVC earlier in the PSRA process might be helpful.
 - The committee discussed how getting consumer engagement outside of the council generally has been challenging, but it needs to be looked at continuously because there is a lot of opportunity for improvement. The Integrated HIV Prevention and

Care Plan places a strong emphasis on the importance of consumer engagement and how all parties have a role in strengthening it.

- A committee member added that attendance at the Community Voices Committee (CVC) has not been strong for several years so getting feedback from consumers is difficult. Bryan asked if the council should consider holding community input sessions for priority setting and resource allocation (PSRA) rather than relying solely on CVC.
- A committee member addressed the comment that a council member felt the council's priority setting was not used in the allocation process. The committee member felt that it is not completely understood that resources for services also come from insurance, rebate, and other sources, and that Ryan White is meant to be the payer of last resort.
- A committee member suggested that the Executive Committee should respond directly to the comments in the evaluation since they are so detailed. They felt it might make the PSRA process easier next time if council leadership and staff address the issues in a transparent fashion.
- A committee member suggested that the council conduct more than one training on conflict of interest throughout the year.
- A committee member pointed out that priority setting is used by the council throughout the year, and not just for resource allocation. Since the two are done so close together, some new council members may not understand how priority setting informs decisions that the council makes throughout the year.
- There is disagreement on whether PSRA materials should be sent out in advance, and if those materials then need to be explained in-person by a facilitator. Either way, council members need to have a full understanding of the PSRA process as they are making decisions.
- A committee member suggested that the council could be more transparent about where the funds that are used for outside facilitation come from and give assurances that is not taking away from funding for council recruitment.
- A meeting participant recommended that each committee review the results of the PSRA evaluation and send their feedback to the Planning and Allocations Committee. They felt it would be easier to get feedback at the committee level than in the larger council meeting.
- A committee member shared that it was their first time going through PSRA and they were confused by some of it. They felt like they would want all the written materials to be reviewed in person because it is a lot for a new person to master. They suggested that extra training on the whole PSRA process might be useful for new council members specifically.
- A committee member felt that PSRA has gone more smoothly when it has been in-person. It's been harder to see the value in outside facilitation when everything is done virtually.
- The committee discussed the benefits of using an outside facilitator.
 - Some members felt that it is not needed because council staff and government representatives are already experts and can guide the process.

- Others felt that staff from government agencies cannot be neutral during the process, and that could be better explained to the council.
- The committee further discussed having an additional meeting to kick off the priority setting and resource allocation (PSRA) process for new council members or for those who want additional training, to explain the entire process.
- A committee member said that managing expectations is helpful. Letting council members know what to expect from the outside facilitation, and how much time it takes to review the data needed to make decisions, would help.
- Thomas Blissett shared that he appreciated the facilitator because it allowed a non-biased voice to help guide the process. He felt that was a better approach than having the Part A and Part B recipients guide the council through its decision making.

IV. Unfinished Business / New Business

- No unfinished business was discussed.
- No new business was discussed.

V. Set agenda for next meeting

- Bryan Bick explained that three committees need to review goals on the monitoring table for the Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan in October. Council staff has proposed combining the three committee meetings into one on Wednesday, October 26 at 9:30 a.m.
- **MOTION:** Mary McCarthy moved to have a combined meeting with the Disparities and Elimination Committee and the Needs Assessment and Evaluation Committee on October 26 at 9:30 a.m. and that it be a hybrid format meeting. The motion was seconded.
 - **DEBATE:** Tyrie Stanley called for debate. There was none.
 - **VOTE:** Tyrie called for a voice vote. The motion was approved unanimously.
 - A committee member asked who will facilitate the joint meeting. Tyrie said it should be one of the co-chairs of the Planning and Allocations Committee.

VI. Announcements: There were no announcements.

VII. Adjourn: Tyrie Stanley adjourned the meeting at 10:42 a.m.

Meeting Summary

- The Planning and Allocations Committee (PAC) reviewed results of the 2022 Priority Setting and Resource Allocation evaluation.
- PAC voted in favor of a combined October meeting with the Disparities Elimination Committee and the Needs Assessment and Evaluation Committee.

Documents distributed before the meeting:

- Proposed agenda for September 28 meeting
- Minutes from July 27 meeting

- Results of 2022 PSRA Evaluation
- FY 2022 PAC Workplan

Additional Documents displayed during the meeting:

- none

BB/cw