

**HIV Health Services Planning Council  
Sacramento TGA**

**Policy and Procedure Manual**

**Section 5 – Executive Committee**

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>SECTION / POLICY TITLE</u></b>	<b>CURRENT VERSION</b>	<b>PREVIOUS VERSION</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</b>		
	EXEC 01 – Became AdAC01	Inactive	2/28/01, 6/96
	EXEC 02 – Council Decision Making	06/24/20	08/22/18, 04/27/16, 05/5/10
	EXEC 03 – Recognition Policy	06/24/20	08/22/18, 04/27/16, 5/23/13

This page intentionally blank

HIV Health Services Planning Council  
Sacramento EMA

Policy Document

Policy Number:	EXEC 01
Date Approved:	6/96
Date Revised:	2/28/01

**Subject:** Administrative Assessment

**Reference:** Ryan White CARE Act, Part A, Section 2602 (b) (4) (c)

**Policy:** The HIV Health Services Planning Council shall meet the Ryan White CARE Act's legislative mandate that Planning Councils "assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the administrative mechanisms for rapidly disbursing CARE Act funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible metropolitan area (EMA)."

In fulfilling this mandate, the Council's Administrative Assessment Workgroup (AAWG) and the Fiscal/Administrative Agent (Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services) will work together to continually improve the administrative processes that affect the quality of care and efficiency of the CARE Program's service delivery system.

**Procedure**

**1. Liaison:** The AAWG will serve as a liaison between the Planning Council and the Fiscal/Administrative Agent (F/AA) to improve communication and collaboration regarding the assessment, development and implementation of administrative mechanisms for the EMA. The AAWG will meet bi-monthly, at minimum, with the F/AA.

**2. Annual Administrative Assessment:** The AAWG will conduct an annual assessment of F/AA administrative mechanisms with the intent of providing feedback and recommendations to the Council and to the F/AA to continually improve such administrative policies and procedures.

**Scoring Tool:** A scoring tool will be used to provide objective scores and quantifiable feedback regarding predetermined standards that are defined by the AAWG with input from the F/AA (see Attachment I for the Scoring Tool used for the FY 2000/2001 assessment).

**b. Quantitative analysis:** The standards on the scoring tool are written to measure F/AA compliance with outcomes that can be measured in quantifiable terms. These outcome standards are written to answer the following questions: "was the task accomplished; to what extent was the task accomplished?" F/AA compliance with each standard is measured from an outcome perspective using the scale 0-5 as follows:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Outcome Measure</i>
<b>5</b>	Outcome met and exceeded
<b>4</b>	Outcome met above minimum
<b>3</b>	Outcome met at minimum
<b>2</b>	Outcome partially met
<b>1</b>	Outcome not met
<b>0</b>	Outcome not addressed

- c. Qualitative analysis:** In addition to the quantitative analysis of outcome measures, a narrative summary will be included in the assessment report to provide a qualitative analysis of the processes used to address each standard. This qualitative analysis will answer the following questions: “how was the task accomplished; were the processes used efficient, were the processes fair, were the processes comprehensive, could the processes be improved?” The qualitative analysis will be summarized in the narrative report under the following sections for each Rating Category: (a) strengths, (b) weaknesses, (c) external factors, and (d) comments/recommendations for improvement. The following scale will be used to guide the qualitative analysis:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Process</i>
5	Exemplary process
4	Above average process, could be improved
3	Average process, could be improved
2	Below average process, needs improvement
1	Below average process, needs major improvement
0	No process in place

- d. Rating Categories:** The Rating Categories for which standards are defined include:
1. Procurement Process
  2. Fiscal Monitoring
  3. Program Monitoring
  4. Tracking Systems
  5. Contract Development
  6. Allocation, Priority Setting and Reallocation
  7. Communication and Reporting
  8. Barriers and Concerns
  9. Timeliness
  10. Flexibility

- e. Methodology for Annual Administrative Assessment** is specific and includes the following components:

1. **Training of Review Panel (AAWG):** A minimum half-day training will be provided to all review panel members at least one week prior to the assessment.
2. **Fiscal/Administrative Agent (F/AA) Preparation:** The Scoring Tool will be provided to the F/AA at least two weeks prior to the assessment so that the F/AA has time to organize and label all documents to be reviewed during the assessment.
3. **Roles and responsibilities:** The roles and responsibilities of the Review Panel members, consultant, Council staff and F/AA staff during the assessment process will be clearly defined:
  - The Review Panel members' roles are to review all documentation as provided by the F/AA and to determine ratings as delineated by the Scoring Tool.
  - The F/AA staff roles are to provide documentation to determine compliance with standards and to answer all questions as presented by Review Panel members.
  - The consultant and Council staff roles are to facilitate the assessment process and to answer any questions as presented by the F/AA or Review Panel members.
  - Only the Review Panel members are to render any opinions regarding F/AA compliance with the standards.
4. **Administrative Assessment Report:** The consultant will draft a summary report regarding the findings of the annual assessment, which must be approved by the Review Panel prior to submission to the F/AA. The findings in the report will include numeric scores regarding F/AA compliance with each standard, as well as a narrative summary of strengths, weaknesses, external factors, comments and recommendations for improvement.
5. **Fiscal/Administrative Agent (F/AA) Response and Plan of Correction:** The F/AA will have thirty days to respond to the Review Panel's summary report by writing a Response and Plan of Correction for each deficiency as noted in the assessment report.
6. **Revision to Assessment Report:** The F/AA Response and Plan of Correction will be submitted to the Review Panel for review. Any final revisions or corrections to the Annual Administrative Assessment Report will then be made as determined by the Review Panel.
7. **Submission of Final Report:** The Review Panel's Final Annual Assessment Report and F/AA Final Response and Plan of Correction will be submitted to the Planning Council and to the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB) within the timeframe specified by HAB.
8. **Quarterly Monitoring of Fiscal/Administrative Agent (F/AA) Plan of Correction:** The AAWG will assess the implementation of the F/AA Plan of Correction on a quarterly basis to ensure ongoing improvement of administrative

mechanisms. The Quarterly Monitoring Form will be developed by the consultant and/or staff upon completion of the Review Panel's Annual Administrative Assessment Report and the F/AA Response and Plan of Correction. Quarterly Progress Reports will be approved by the AAWG and submitted to the Executive Committee of the Council for follow up as needed.

- 9. Additional Assessment and Monitoring Activities:** As the Planning Council, AAWG and/or F/AA deem necessary, additional assessment and/or monitoring activities will be developed and implemented to ensure ongoing improvement in F/AA administrative mechanisms. For example, a survey to solicit feedback from CARE program service providers regarding F/AA performance is in the developmental stages. As new assessment and monitoring activities are developed, each will be included in these Administrative Assessment policies and procedures.

INACTIVE - BECAME ADAC 01

**HIV Health Services Planning Council  
Sacramento TGA**

**Policy and Procedure Manual**

**Subject:** Council Decision Making      **No.:** EXEC 02  
**Date Effective:** 02/99  
**Date Revised:** 08/22/18  
**Date Reviewed:** 06/24/20

**Reference:** OPEN MEETING LAWS IN CALIFORNIA:  
THE BROWN ACT: GOV'T CODE: 54950-54960-5  
Section(s): 54953(a), 54953.3, 54953.5(a-b), 54954(b),  
54954.1, 54954.2, 54954.3, 54957.7(a-c)

**Policy:**

The Council seeks to conduct business in an organized and effective manner, which requires attention to how the decision making process is conducted during meetings, as well as attention to expectations for member participation in the process. The following will be used during Council meetings, committee meetings and/or related events in which members participate in decision-making activities for the Council.

**Procedure:**

1. With rare exception, all recommendations are to come to the full Council meeting in writing. Information is to be provided that includes a statement of the issue(s), background of previous discussions and committee actions (if any), impact of the proposed decision and issues of concern that most frequently surfaced as the item moved through committee. The action request form, in addition to any other related paperwork, such as a policy and procedure, is provided to Council support staff no later than 12 days prior to the Council meeting.

On occasion, with Council approval and/or at the discretion of the Council Chairperson, additions to the agenda may be made after the agenda packet is mailed.

2. Each item placed on the Council agenda will have a spokesperson identified for the item. Typically, this is a Committee Chair or a

Council officer, but may vary with the item under consideration. The public will be canvassed noting any participants who wish to speak to an agenda item.

3. Council members are expected to come to the monthly meeting fully prepared to discuss items on the agenda. Each member is expected to read the items included in the agenda packet, which is mailed in advance of the meeting, with questions noted and other preparation completed for discussion at the meeting.
4. The Council Chair introduces each item or speaker. The following order is used when moving items forward for action:
  - a. Chair recognizes the speaker and item;
  - b. The speaker provides a brief introduction and makes a motion for action of the item as presented;
  - c. A second of the motion is sought from the membership. If obtained;
  - d. Public comment is requested by the Chair;
  - e. A brief amount of time is made available for discussion of the motion by Council/committee members;
  - f. The question is called and a vote is taken regarding the motion;
  - g. If no second of the motion is obtained, a brief amount of time may be given to determining next steps for the issue under discussion. Unless time is of the essence in relation to the issue, the item will be brought back to the next Council meeting for further consideration;
  - h. If discussion breaks down during this process, the Chair may direct the item back to committee for further consideration. Alternatively, the issue may be forwarded to the Executive Committee for interim decision if timing requires.
5. Council should limit discussion to areas of serious concern relative to the impact of Council's decisions. If through discussion, clarification and/or adjustments do not resolve issues or concerns, the item should be directed to the appropriate committee for further consideration.
6. Council does not have decision making authority relative to selection of contractors, contract monitoring or similar matters directly relating to responsibilities of the fiscal administrative representative.

7. Members should be courteous to other Council members and not engage in extraneous conversations. These conversations inhibit the full participation of members and slow the pace of the meeting.
8. Although not within the purview of the Council, members should take every opportunity to expand their knowledge about HIV related efforts occurring in the region and nationally. Coordination of efforts and/or simple recognition of efforts are important considerations at various intervals.
9. Council meetings will be conducted using the most current version of Robert’s Rules of Order.
10. Council members are to abide by all policies and procedures related to conflict of interest (Section 03, GOV 06 of the Policies and Procedures Manual).
11. Council members must use the process detailed in the Grievance Policy when complaints cannot be resolved through Committee or Council processes. The Grievance Policy is contained in Section 03, GOV 05 of the HHSPC Policy and Procedures Manual.

Signed:   
Kristina Kendricks-Clark, Chair

Date: 6/24/20



# HIV Health Services Planning Council Sacramento TGA

## Policy and Procedure Manual

**Subject:** Community Recognition Guidelines

**No.:** Exec 03

**Date Approved:** 05/22/13

**Last Revised:** 08/22/18

**Date Reviewed:** 06/24/20

### Background:

The Council acknowledges the many contributions from individuals, groups and communities needed to address effectively the deleterious effects of HIV infection on society. In keeping with this understanding it is the position of the Council to highlight “special achievements” that facilitate the advancement of services to the HIV at-risk and/or afflicted population.

### Policy:

The Council will establish and maintain a recognition program in accordance with the guidelines herein.

### Definition:

Recognition criteria: Events, behaviors or actions that demonstrate exemplary advocacy, dedication, initiative, innovation, role modeling and compassion. Examples include (but are not limited to) project leadership, community organizing, years of service, excellence in care, committee work, teamwork, Council contribution, above and beyond generic.

### Guidelines:

1. Recognition must have the following characteristics:
  - Sincerity – should reflect genuine expression of appreciation

- Significance – representative of the values, goals and priorities of the Council's work
- Adaptability – no single recognition applies to every action
- Relevance –any recognition may be enhanced by its personal utility and/or sentimental value
- Timeliness – prompt response to the behavior that is to be recognized

Adapted from (Jim Brintnall "What Makes a Good reward")

## 2. Criteria

- Measurable and documentable impact on a program, project, event, service, consultation or committee work
- Contribution to the achievement of the Council's objectives is above and beyond expectations
- Contribution has been consistent
- Years of service

## 3. Types of recognition

- Certificates of appreciation
- Acknowledgement letter signed by the Council Chair
- Resolution passed by the Council and signed by the Council Chair
- Board of Supervisors resolution with presentation at Board meeting
- Website recognition for the month with member picture
- Plaque presented at Council meeting
- Local media announcement

## 4. Eligibility

Any person or community organization who demonstrates commitment and action in support of the Council's work. Present Council members actively participating in the work of the organization. Past Council members with significant length of service

5. Nominations

Any seated member of the Council may nominate for recognition any individual, group or community.

6. Procedure

Nominations for recognition will be submitted to the Council Executive Committee in writing, using required form(s) established by the Committee, who will determine the merits of the nomination.

Justification for recognition must be provided, outlining the activities, achievements and/or service above and beyond that serve as the basis for recognition.

Within 30 days of receiving a nomination, the Executive Committee (with input from the requestor) will determine the type of recognition. Informal recognition will be defined as a letter of recognition or personal appearance with public recognition at Council meeting; formal recognition may include a plaque, media notice, pin, Board of Supervisors Resolution, etc.)

Depending on the type of recognition and logistical considerations, delivery of the award should be within 30 days.

Signed:



Kristina Kendricks-Clark, Chair

Date: 6/24/20

This page intentionally blank