Matrix of Planning Council/Body (PC/B) Support Staffing Models: Pros and Cons[*]

Note: Most common structures indicated, as reported in the DMHAP 2016 PC/B assessment

Structural Model	Description/Examples	Pros	Cons
1. PC/B Support Staff Report to Recipient *[Most frequent reported structure for TGAs in 2016 assessment]*	PC/B staff are employed by the recipient agency, and the PC Support (PCS) manager is supervised by the recipient's Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program (RWHAP) Part A Program Manager	▪ Places all RWHAP Part A staffing within a single reporting structure ▪ Provides an organizationally simple structure that includes all RWHAP Part A-related staff	▪ Makes the PCS manager seem primarily responsible to the recipient rather than the PC/B ▪ Makes the PC/B appear part of the recipient's domain and accountable to the recipient rather than operating as a separate entity that collaborates with the recipient but is responsible to the CEO ▪ Often makes the PC/B feel that it lacks the freedom and authority to make independent decisions ▪ Puts PCS manager in a very difficult position in cases where the PC/B takes actions that are not supported by the recipient ▪ Provides no clear avenue for impartial problem-solving when problems arise in the relationship between the PC/B and recipient

---

[*] Prepared based on findings from the 2016 assessment of RWHAP Part A Planning Councils/Bodies, conducted by EGMC for the HIV/AIDS Bureay's Division of Metropolitan HIV/AIDS Programs (HAB/DMHAP). Also includes comments from DMHAP Project Officers during a February 2017 meeting to discuss assessment findings. Matrix prepared under Task Order TA003111 through the MSCG/Ryan White Technical Assistance Contract.

Structural Model	Description/Examples	Pros	Cons
2. PC/B Staff Report to the Same Official within the HIV Unit	Both PCS and recipient staff report to the same manager within the unit responsible for the RWHAP Part A program, where the designated RWHAP Part A program manager is *not* the head of that unit	▪ Provides an organizationally straightforward structure, with all staff supervised within the HIV unit ▪ Avoids having the PCS manager report to the recipient's RWHAP Part A manager ▪ Provides a "parallel" structure, in which the PCS manager has status similar to that of the recipient program manager	▪ Creates many of the same challenges as #1: PC/B may be viewed as responsible to the HIV/AIDS unit rather than as an independent body chosen by the CEO, and PCS manager may be seen as accountable and responsive to the HIV/AIDS Unit rather than the PC/B
3. PC/B Staff and Recipient Report to the Same Senior Official	Both PCS and recipient RWHAP Part A Program manager report to a senior official within the same agency, usually the Health Department – e.g., both report to an Assistant Secretary or Deputy Commissioner of Health	▪ Gives the PC/B a sense of autonomy, and the ability to act as a partner to the recipient rather than under its authority ▪ Ensures some attention to the PC/B's work at a high level within the agency ▪ Can provide an informed but impartial avenue for resolving problems in the relationship between the PC/B and recipient	▪ Requires identifying a senior manager willing and able to provide informed supervision and attention to PC/B staff, which can be difficult ▪ Offers few benefits if the senior manager is engaged in name only, and leaves real decisions to the recipient
4. PC/B Staff Report to a Different Agency or Component of Local Government	PCS staff are responsible to a different component of municipal government from the recipient, sometimes the office of the CEO (e.g., Board of Supervisors or Mayor's Office)	▪ Demonstrates that the PC/B operates as an independent planning body, separate from the recipient ▪ Gives the PC/B status and importance, especially if staff report to the office of the CEO ▪ Can contribute to attention from the CEO on issues such as timely appointments ▪ Provides an opportunity for the PC/B to serve as a source of expert advice on HIV issues for the CEO	▪ Requires some continuing time and commitment from the responsible component, which can be difficult if HIV is not an ongoing priority for the jurisdiction ▪ Usually requires managing the PC/B budget through a separate agency from the recipient, which requires some fiscal management and reporting

Structural Model	Description/Examples	Pros	Cons
5. PC/B Support Function is Contracted to an External Entity *[Most frequently reported structure for EMAs in 2016 assessment]*	PCS support is contracted to a nonprofit or for-profit entity, usually through a competitive bidding process, with the contractor hiring staff and providing supervision and fiscal management, and sometimes subcontracting for technical tasks	▪ Provides separation and autonomy for the PC/B ▪ Enables the PC/B to specify a scope of work and participate in decision making about the contractor ▪ Can provide more flexibility in hiring of staff and subcontracting for additional services than is possible within most jurisdictions ▪ Can facilitate PC/B access to experts in multiple skill areas, especially if the contractor is able to assign some staff to the PC/B on a part-time or as-needed basis	▪ Does not work well when the recipient rather than the PC/B determines the scope of work, establishes the budget, and decides what entity will be hired ▪ Can be problematic unless the budget amount and use of funds are renegotiated annually ▪ Can lead to poor quality PC support, especially when there is a lack of appropriate monitoring for quality and task completion (by the PC/B) and meeting fiscal and management requirements (by the recipient) ▪ Often becomes problematic in locations with a lack of qualified and interested entities, leading to use of non-local consultants who may cost more and provide less support than needed
6. PC/B Support Function is Part Contracted, Part Provided by Staff	A part of the PCS function – either logistics or technical/planning aspects – is contracted to an external entity, and the rest is done by staff using one of the other reporting structures	▪ If technical/planning functions are contracted, same benefits as Model #5 ▪ Contracting logistics to an experienced entity can be efficient, making it easier and sometimes less expensive to handle tasks such as obtaining food or copying materials	▪ Can create the same challenges and problems as #5
7. PC/B Support Function is Contracted by Staff who are Located in the Recipient's Office	A contractor hires PCS staff that are then work out of the recipient's offices; this often occurs in municipalities that do not consider PCS staff to be permanent employees or are not permitted to hire new staff	▪ Can provide capable, experienced staff if position descriptions and qualifications are carefully determined, with PC/B participation, and the contract staff are accountable to the PC/B ▪ Enables municipalities to staff PC support even if they are not able to hire permanent employees	▪ If the recipient is responsible for day-to-day supervision, can create many of the same problems as #1 and #2 ▪ May involve relatively low salaries and/or limited benefits, contributing to high turnover ▪ Can lead to situations in which contract staff do not feel valued or supported