

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, August 08, 2019
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Welcome and Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes (*July 11, 2019*)

Report of Chair

Report of Staff

Discussion Items

- Report Back on Attendance Violations
 - Removal Appeal
- Next Steps for Fall Open Nominations

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.

The next Nominations Committee meeting is scheduled for
Thursday, September 12, 2019 from 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. at the
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org

**Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, July 11, 2019
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th St., Suite 320, Philadelphia PA 19107

Present: Gloria Taylor, Juan Baez, Lupe Diaz, Sharee Heaven

Excused: Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Samuel Romero (Co-Chair), Steven Zick

Guests: Terry Smith-Flores

Staff: Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri

Call to Order:

S. Heaven called the meeting to order at 12:30 PM.

Approval of Agenda

S. Heaven presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, G. Taylor seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes

S. Heaven presented the May 9th meeting minutes for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, G. Taylor seconded to approve the May 9, 2019 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Chair

Co-Chairs S. Romero and M. Cappuccilli were not present for the meeting, so L. Diaz and S. Heaven offered to chair the meeting. They reported that the social went very well, and Positive Committee had a well-attended meeting for the June evening meeting regarding mental health. Both had new individuals in attendance. L. Diaz also mentioned her meeting in Baltimore for UCHAPS. L. Diaz reported that many cities are utilizing night meetings to accommodate members.

Report of Staff

D. Law reported that OHP staff developed a report about outreach in response to conversations with the CDC and HRSA project officers. The handout emphasized the push for inclusivity and diversity within the Planning Body. D. Law suggested everyone review the handout and come up with any ideas that may be useful. D. Law noted that there already have been some recruitment efforts, e.g. night meetings, tabling, possibly removing those with attendance violations. D. Law said the Planning Council consists of 44 people, reminding everyone of the 55 person maximum and 35 person minimum, which should be reflective of the epidemic. She explained that the current effort revolves around targeting younger people to participate. L. Diaz for clarification on “younger.” D. Law replied that the CDC did not define this, but many people on the Planning Council are older, and there isn’t anyone in their 20s. According to the CDC, race and gender are also concerns for representation. D. Law reported that the council currently has 54% African-American individuals, which could be slightly improved to fully represent the 60% within the epidemic. The Planning Council is also only 40% men which does not reflect the 70% within the epidemic. Geographically,

D. Law expressed that the council has low representation for PA and high representation for NJ. Philadelphia representation is on the cusp.

T. Smith-Flores asked what the age range the CDC wants to recruit. D. Law explained that “youth” is consider 18-24 years old. G. Taylor mentioned that younger people may have other obligations and likely cannot attend earlier meetings due to school and jobs—this is why evening meetings might be a good idea. D. Law agreed, reiterating the fact that there is certainly a push for the evening meetings. D. Laws emphasized the idea that the Planning Body needs to increase its efforts.

L. Diaz asked about younger individuals at the social and if they filled out any applications. D. Law said that one young man who stood out filled out an application. L. Diaz asked if there have been any online applications. D. Law mentioned only receiving one thus far. D. Law pointed to the handout and mentioned how not all of these efforts might be Nominations, a lot are also Positive’s or just HIPC’s responsibility in general.

S. Heaven commented on the issue of retention. She said younger people came out for the evening, but it’s simply a matter of balancing day and evening meetings. D. Law agreed and said not all meetings would be evening meetings. She continued that HIPC may consider doing an evening meeting quarterly as a substitution or in addition to the already existing meeting time.

L. Diaz expressed concern about co-chairs’ jobs or other obligations that might compromise their availability for evening meetings. D. Law mentioned N. Johns’s brief survey at the Prevention Summit, revealing that a fair amount of respondents said they preferred night meetings. G. Taylor asked if the Planning Body was basing meeting times solely off of potential recruitment time preferences. D. Law said not necessarily—it is just a matter acknowledging the difference between preferences and barriers and balancing the two. She assured the group that there is a new population and new voices needed, but the current members are not being ignored. L. Diaz reiterated that these recruitment efforts might work against current Council members, ultimately pushing them out. D. Law said that current members can certainly take a survey as well, and she suggested L. Diaz propose this at the Executive Committee, the committee consisting of all the co-chairs, for discussion. T. Smith-Flores asked if there can be two meetings: a day and night. D. Law said that this is something for Executive Committee to discuss and decide.

S. Heaven mentioned that reflectiveness of the epidemic was previously up for discussion at an Executive Committee meeting. S. Heaven had asked about evening meetings during the Executive Committee meeting. She continued to say that the group discussed recruitment and possibly changing the meet time. In the meeting, the Executive Committee emphasized that these efforts would not be to eliminate current members, but enrich the discussion and reflectiveness. S. Heaven explained to the group that everyone would need to wait and see how things panned out, and she would report back to Nominations Committee once Executive Committee meets.

T. Smith-Flores stated that people can’t not work, so she liked the idea of quarterly evening meetings. J. Baez wondered if HIPC decided on evening meetings, if the subcommittees would have to follow suit. D. Law said this is up to the subcommittees and the hypothetical new committee members. Regarding the evening meeting, D. Law and L. Diaz mentioned that there were about five people at the evening meeting who were either new faces or members who have trouble making daytime meetings. At the evening meeting, D. Law said she talked to two people who said that their jobs did not allow for them to come earlier.

D. Law explained there were also a lot of new people from the Prevention Summit. J. Baez asked about the time of a potential evening meeting. D. Law said that the evening meeting had previously been 6 PM – 8 PM. However, D. Law reiterated that these sorts of decisions would ultimately be up to Executive Committee.

Discussion Items

--Debrief on Recruitment Activities--

D. Law asked for feedback on what everyone thought of the social. S. Heaven commented on the success of the social, but it seemed like the bulk of the people were already Planning Council members. Also, she wasn't sure if the new people had even filled out applications. D. Law said that two people filled out applications, and a lot of people came after 5:30 PM because of work. D. Law said they didn't push anything onto the group that had come later—they just talked to them. However, people did seem to enjoy it. D. Law mentioned J. Baez's interns who had attended and asked about their feedback. J. Baez explained that they enjoyed the social but didn't really understand the purpose of the meeting. D. Law mentioned other individuals at the meeting from CHOP who were definitely more the target population, but D. Law was unsure if they submitted applications or would return for the next meeting.

L. Diaz asked when the applications are due. D. Law replied that they would be during August. J. Baez suggested reaching out to organizations such as Galaei and Black Pride and directly asking for individuals join. L. Diaz mentioned tabling at the Mazzoni Center as a recruitment effort. J. Baez suggested even reaching out to directors and letting them know of an opportunity to have a voice and vote in the Planning Council around topics applicable to them.

D. Law asked how they might reach out to directors. S. Heaven said a letter would get tossed to the side, so talking in person might be best. L. Diaz noted that if they ask agencies to send people, they will most likely send people in management. Inevitably, these individuals in management are in their 30s or older. L. Diaz said that the recruitment efforts would not reach the target population.

S. Heaven said they should ask CDC if they have any recommendations on how they want Planning Council to recruit. She commented that ultimately, people will come because they *want* to be there, and some people might come up until their need is met and then leave. S. Heaven asked about whether future meetings were planned after the Positive Committee's evening meeting. D. Law said no. To wrap it up, S. Heaven said she would report back with Executive Committee's discussion on recruitment after it occurs.

D. Law said its open nominations time for applications. She explained that this is a very lengthy process, and she wanted everyone to keep that in mind. D. Law said they will be reviewing applications in September.

--Review Membership Attendance--

D. Law mentioned that they had 44 members, but #39 recently resigned, bringing the number down to 43. D. Law explained the color coding on the spreadsheet: blue are new people and red/yellow are the people who have violated attendance. She reminded everyone of the attendance policy—3 in a

row and/or 5 or more absences in a year is a means for removal. L. Diaz asked what the purpose of reviewing the spreadsheet today was. D. Law responded that she would like a vote from everyone today on removals.

T. Smith-Flores asked about what a leave of absence means on the spreadsheet. D. Law explained that it is usually for individuals who are on medical leave or going through other special circumstances. In most if not all cases, they must send a notice before they leave.

J. Baez suggested that removal letters due to attendance violations let people know they can still come to the meetings, they just can't vote. L. Diaz said that they have reached out numerous times to some people. J. Baez agreed, voicing that the council needs consistency, and maybe they should look at the letters and see if they can offer alternatives. T. Smith-Flores asked if the group had seen the warning letter. The group responded with yes.

J. Baez presented the question: what are the circumstances that prevent them from engaging? J. Baez said they should include this in the letter when they send out violation notices. D. Law asked if the group separate the approach for provider representatives and non-providers. In this case, he suggested, they would be more lenient to non-providers. G. Taylor said the committee should send a letter asking if these people are interested or not regardless of whether they are a provider or non-provider. G. Taylor continued, saying if people cannot come, they just need to let the Council know. G. Taylor explained that it sometimes it doesn't matter what is going on—everyone has to make sacrifices to come to the meetings.

The group asked if they would be sending out warning letters or removal letters. G. Taylor suggested they ask most people what is happening first, but some people have to be definitely removed. The group seemed to agree and would determine based on each individual and their history.

D. Law said they would only talk about people in violation.

— #12 —

S. Heaven suggested that the group start at #12. It looked like this person had 5 excused and 1 where they were just absent. L. Diaz asked if there is a reason for the absence. D. Law said it's always the same reason, and this person has been contacted multiple times about violations. Everyone agreed by consensus they send out a removal letter.

— #15 —

L. Diaz asked if she can reach out to number 15. L. Diaz explained that this person comes to the subcommittees and makes an effort. The group asked about #15. L. Diaz said she might know why this person has been absent. By consensus, they decided to do a verbal warning. L. Diaz reaffirmed that she would handle the verbal warning.

— #17 —

The group moved on to #17. D. Law commented that this person has been to subcommittees. D. Law asked if they should reach out. G. Taylor asked what constitutes getting rid of someone or simply sending a warning. S. Heaven said this is because staff might know if someone is not there for a good reason or certain circumstances. She also said they might know if they are participating in subcommittees. D. Law expressed that she is not sure if someone reached out to this person already. Therefore, the group agreed they should reach out to ask if something is wrong, see if this person eventually comes back, and then send a removal letter if they do not respond or return. Though there

are many absences, D. Law explained that this person has been to a lot of subcommittees. L. Diaz volunteered to reach out. The committee agreed on this decision by consensus.

— #22 —

D. Law said this person had had an unexpected leave of absence, but as soon as they came back, they went to a subcommittee meeting. D. Law suggested they ask K.C. or D.G. to talk to this person. The group agreed by consensus.

— #24 —

Based on attendance violations and poor communication, the group agreed by consensus to remove this person.

— #26 —

D. Law said the person had definitely been to subcommittee, and she continued to say they worked during school hours. D. Law explained that this person is a subcommittee co-chair. L. Diaz said they are very active when present at committees. Unfortunately, this person cannot usually make the meeting time. They agreed by consensus to give a verbal warning.

— #32 —

D. Law mentioned that she does not think this person has been to subcommittee, and they also have six absences. L. Diaz explained that she was leaning towards a removal letter. J. Baez countered and said that the committee had never reached out to this person before, and so they should just send a warning and touch base. The group agreed by consensus to send a warning.

— #33 —

The group mentioned that a warning letter has been sent already to this person. D. Law said, yes, they are a repeating violation. The committee agreed by consensus to send a letter of removal.

— #34 —

Since #34 was present, they pleaded their case to the group. They explained that sometimes people may not feel comfortable letting others know about personal details in their lives. #34 suggested that returning or new members should go through attendance policy during orientation such as leave of absence and other situations. J. Baez said they should certainly let staff know if/when something is happening. J. Baez expressed the importance of good attendance, so people know what is going on and they can use their voices appropriately. #34 asked about people who cannot reach out. J. Baez said that is why the committee sends out letters—to see what is happening. He continue to explain that when the committee sends out a letter, it is not about whether someone received it or not, it is just about whether or not the letter was sent. S. Heaven reminded everyone that they need to let them know by whatever means, if something is going on.

— #38 —

D. Law mentioned that this person was present for the last two meetings. S. Heaven volunteered to talk to this person. The group agreed by consensus to simply give a verbal warning.

— #40 —

G. Taylor offered to talk to this person. It is expressed by T. Smith-Flores that this person is possibly resigning. G. Taylor said that she will definitely ask tomorrow. The group agreed by consensus to allow for G. Taylor to talk with this individual.

— #41—

The group agreed to a removal of #41 by consensus.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements

None.

Adjournment

Motion: G Taylor moved, J. Baez seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:02 PM. **Motion passed: All in favor.**

Respectfully submitted,

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from May 09, 2019
- AACO Outreach for Reflectiveness Submission
- September 2018 - August 2019 Attendance Sheet

Membership as of Aug 2019

	Members as of Aug 2019	Percentage of new membership	Goals (40-41)	Phila = 71.5%	New Jersey = 12.5%	PA Counties = 16%
White	11	29%	22.3%	8	1	2
Black	21	55%	58.2%	18	3	0
Hispanic	6	16%	15.4%	4	1	1
API	0	0%	1.0%	0	0	0
Am. Ind.	0	0%	0.19%	0	0	0
Multi/Unk	0	0%	3.0%	0	0	0
Total Member	38			30	5	3
				78.73%	13.12%	7.87%
Male	17	45%	71%	15	1	1
Female	20	52%	28%	15	3	2
Transgender	1	3%	1%	1	0	0
Unaligned Consumers	15	39%	33%			
total PLWHA	17	45%				

Ideal Membership

	Ideal Members	Percentage of new membership	Goals (39-40)	Phila = 71.5%	New Jersey = 12.5%	PA Counties = 16%
White	12	22%	22.3%	10	1	2
Black	32	58%	58.2%	26	4	5
Hispanic	8	15%	15.4%	4	1	1
API	0	0%	1.0%	0	0	0
Am. Ind.	0	0%	0.19%	0	0	0
Multi/Unk	2	2%	3.0%	1	0	0
Total Me	55			39	7	9
				70.91%	12.73%	16.36%
Male	39	71%	71%	28	4	5
Female	15	27%	28%	12	2	3
Transger	1	2%	1%	1	0	0
Unaligned Consumers	19	35%	33%			
total PLV	28	51%				

