

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, December 12, 2019

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ❖ Call to Order

- ❖ Welcome and Introductions

- ❖ Approval of Agenda

- ❖ Approval of Minutes (*September 12, 2019*)

- ❖ Report of Chair

- ❖ Report of Staff

- ❖ Discussion Items
 - Debrief of Current Planning Cycle
 - Planning for Upcoming Planning Cycle

- ❖ 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, January 12, 2020 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

Discussion Item:

—Review of Applications—

D. Law administered the packet of new applications and reviewed the needs. She directed everyone to the membership chart. She explained that 37 council members represented the number of members after the removal of J.S. and reinstatement of P.G. The minimum number of members is 35, and the maximum is 5. She noted that there were currently 15 applicants—2 of the applications came in yesterday, September 1st, and missed the deadline. The applications were also missing the tax certifications. In terms of gaps in demographics, D. Law mentioned the need for PA county representatives and African American men. She said that everyone must keep in mind that for two providers on the council, there needs to be at least one consumer. She stated that the current percentage of unaligned consumers was 40%.

D. Law commented that some members' terms expired, but they did not reapply. There were 6 individuals whose terms expired, and only 2 of 6 reapplied. M. Cappuccilli confirmed that out of the 15 applicants, only 12 are not new applicants. D. Law expressed her difficulty with keeping in contact or getting a hold of people who needed to reapply. Two addresses were not deliverable, and one person made a call but did not submit an application.

M. Cappuccilli pointed out that they only have three members from the PA counties. L. Diaz commented that one of the people representing the counties also does not live in the counties. D. Law continued with the discussion on demographic representation. D. Law acknowledged a lack of representation for substance abuse treatment providers. She said there was also only one hospital or health care planning agency representative. HIPC needs more non-elected community leaders (like a priest). They were also in need of Part C representatives, D. Law representatives, and those who were formerly incarcerated.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the two reapplying members were in good standing, and D. Law said yes. D. Law said she tried to get applicants to planning council meetings before they're even members. M. Cappuccilli asked if there were any applicants who were noncompliant with the tax certification. D. Law said there were some individuals who were not. She also commented that if people had applied earlier in the application process, she was able to get the Certificate of Tax Compliance done with them.

L. Diaz asked if HIPC needed more male representation. D. Law responded that HIPC always needs more representation since the epidemic is more heavily concentrated in men. D. Law listed the applicants who did not have tax certifications: #107, #110, #113, and #114. G. Taylor asked about #101's missing tax cert. D. Law said she was able to reach out to this person to help them out, and they have since submitted one.

The group all reviewed and scored the applications individually.

L. Diaz asked if #102 was from NJ counties, and D. Law said no, they were not. L. Diaz asked if this person had been to the meetings, and D. Law affirmed this. M. Cappuccilli asked about age, and L. Diaz said that the age was listed as 22 years old. Everyone agreed that this person was a good candidate primarily because of their age.

M. Cappuccilli asked if there was anyone from MANNA. D. Law said that the current representative for MANNA was stepping off, and someone else was applying to replace this person. D. Law clarified that the person had since attended a meeting from the time of submitting the application.

M. Cappuccilli asked if #105 had attended any meetings—D. Law said yes. L. Diaz asked about their tax certifications, and D. Law said the applicant had turned everything in.

D. Law said #106 and #107 recently emailed this morning (September 12th), and #106 did not have a tax certification. M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz commented on how #106 is from the PA counties. They asked if this applicant had attended any meetings. D. Law did not believe the applicant had come to any meetings. She also added that though the applicant is from the PA counties, they represent a Philadelphia agency.

M. Cappuccilli asked about the emails D. Law was sending out to applicants. D. Law clarified that she would send out an email confirming receipt of the application, and then she would email them about all upcoming meetings. She explained that applicants usually responded, saying whether or not they would attend. However, #106 and #107 had not been responding to any emails until the morning of September 12th.

M. Cappuccilli asked if #107 had been to any meetings. He pointed out that the application said that this person had attended meetings. D. Law said that if they had attended meetings, they did not sign in or say hello to the staff. Therefore, there was no way of figuring out whether or not they were actually at meetings. D. Law figured that individuals might be confused and think that AACO meetings are also Planning Council meetings.

L. Diaz asked if it was still true that #108 had not attended any meetings. D. Law said that someone else from the same organization had initially applied but ended up withdrawing their application. Thus, #108 applied late (August 12th) so the organization would still have representation on the council. D. Law confirmed that this person has a tax certification.

J. Baez asked if #109 had been to any meetings, and D. Law said that they were not able to come to the last meeting, but they would most likely come today, September 12th.

D. Law said that #110 does not have email, so she was not able to reach the applicant. She reported that this was a reapplication, and this person has had many attendance issues. M. Cappuccilli commented on how the applicant did not appear to have a tax certification. G. Taylor asked about the process of receiving a tax certification and what would happen if they did not receive it. D. Law said that she would help individuals fill out the certification, and people were usually cleared. If they were not cleared, she would ask if they were a tenant of their building: if they were, everything was fine, but if they were an owner, they would need to follow up with the city for clearance.

L. Diaz asked if #111 had been to meetings. D. Law said that she believed this person had only been to the PrEP Workgroup.

M. Cappuccilli suggested that in the future, D. Law go through each application one by one and offer important information that may affect scoring. The group could ask questions and then score them individually. L. Diaz commented on how everybody seemed to have similar questions, so this may be an efficient process for scoring.

J. Baez asked about the Understanding of Planning Council (PC) column and its importance on the scoring sheet. J. Baez suggested that having an understanding of the PC doesn't require people to have attended meetings, and this column might ultimately involve prejudice.

L. Diaz asked if #112 was in good standing when they left the PC. D. Law said that they are in good standing and are actually a current member of the PC reapplying. They are not a former member, she just checked the wrong box on the application by accident.

L. Diaz asked about numbers for NJ. M. Cappuccilli said they currently have 5, but it could be 7 based on incoming applications. D. Law said someone's term ended, and J. Baez pointed out that this might make it so they have underrepresentation for the PA counties.

D. Law pointed out that #114 had been to two subcommittee meetings. She asked the group to keep in mind that #113 and #114 do not have tax certifications. However, it is still possible they can turn them in in time. #113 said that they are from Kennedy Health as Patient Care Coordinator. D. Law clarified that this is not where the applicant currently works, she just has experience with this place. Therefore, there is no way to know her affiliation with the organization.

M. Cappuccilli asked if #113 has attended PC meetings, and D. Law was unaware of who the applicant was. M. Cappuccilli and G. Taylor pointed out that this person wrote that they had attended PC before. G. Taylor said she believed this person now works at Rowan. M. Cappuccilli commented that this person had not yet submitted their tax certification. G. Taylor asked the consequences, and M. Cappuccilli replied that it might disqualify them. D. Law said that the application had just been submitted the day before, so she hadn't gotten a chance to talk to them. G. Taylor asked if they should still score the applicant. D. Law said yes, but if they fail the tax certification then the applicant cannot be appointed.

D. Law collected the score sheets from everybody.

J. Baez said that in all his years of membership, 37 is the lowest membership that they have ever had. L. Diaz voiced her concern about only 2 out of 6 members reapplying.

D. Law administered the combined scoring sheets.

—Application #101—

Everyone agreed that the applicant scored well. The group unanimously decided to recommend the applicant.

—Application #102—

D. Law commented on #102, saying that committee had given them a nearly perfect score. The group unanimously decided to recommend the applicant.

—Application #103—

L. Diaz said that that there were very strong applications this year. J. Baez said if #103 gets their tax certifications, they should be recommended. The group agreed.

—Application #104—

The group decided to recommend applicant #104.

—Application #105—

Everyone agreed to recommend applicant #105. D. Law reminded everyone that they should have a good ratio between client/provider.

—Application #106—

J. Baez said that applicant #106 scored low for him, and M. Cappuccilli agreed. J. Baez said that they would be a good candidate in regards to representation, however. L. Diaz countered this, saying that this person had not responded to any emails and may be an unreliable member.

M. Cappuccilli called for a vote. 1 member voted to accept the member, and the other 3 members voted against #106.

J. Baez noted that the applicant had a tax certification. J. Baez asked if they have someone else from the agency the applicant represented. D. Law said that there was also someone else from the agency applying who got a higher score but does not have a tax certification. The group said that this person applying may have more flexibility coming to the meetings because they have a managerial position.

The group voted again, and everyone voted to recommend applicant #106.

—Application #107—

M. Cappuccilli said they are still waiting for tax certifications. D. Law mentioned that #107 and another applicant are from the same agency. She said that she reached out multiple times asking for tax certifications. She was hoping that the applicant would come to the HIPC meeting today and give the tax certification. L. Diaz said that they could send a letter saying that they cannot recommend them if they do not have a certification.

—Application #108—

Everyone agreed that #108 scored low for them. D. Law said that this person is from AIDS Health Care Foundation. M. Cappuccilli said they were good for representation, L. Diaz commented that they did not offer a lot of information to score on. D. Law said that this person has a tax certification and is supposed to come to the PC meeting. Everyone decided to recommend the applicant.

—Application #109—

Everyone scored this applicant well, and they all unanimously decided to recommend the applicant.

—Application #110—

Everyone agreed that the applicant did not score well. D. Law said this applicant was not responding after sending in the application. The applicant has transportation issues, and D. Law said that she had offered to help. One committee member voted to recommend the applicant, and 3 people voted against the applicant. J. Baez said that he was indifferent—the applicant is from the PA counties, but they also might not attend meetings anyways.

Everyone ultimately decided that this person would not be recommended.

—Application #111—

L. Diaz said that this person did not score well because they did not offer a lot of information. J. Baez said that their age fits a need in demographics and that they do linkage to care. G. Taylor commented that the meeting time and length of the PC meetings might not be great for this individual.

The group still agreed to recommend applicant #111.

—Application #112—

Everyone unanimously decided to recommend applicant #112.

—Application #113—

D. Law commented that the committee scored #113 well. M. Cappuccilli said that the applicant looked good, but they still need tax certifications. He also mentioned that this applicant is from NJ counties. The group decided to recommend applicant #113 if tax certifications come in.

—Application #114—

M. Cappuccilli said that this applicant had a good score but also still needed tax certifications. L. Diaz suggested the committee send the same letter to #114 as they are sending #107. The group agreed. D. Law said they would be at 40 membership if they put #114 through. The group decided to recommend applicant #114 if tax certifications came through.

—Application #115—

M. Cappuccilli confirmed that #115 was a reapplicant. The group agreed to recommend #115.

D. Law said that based on the past discussion, they were accepting 14 out of the 15 applicants, putting them at 45 members (instead of 47 because of the two reapplicants). Three of the new applicants have pending tax certifications, so if they do not go through there would be 42 members total.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. Motion: L. Diaz moved, S. Romero seconded to adjourn the meeting at 1:43 pm. Approved general consensus.

Respectfully submitted,

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Nominations Committee September 12, 2019 Agenda
- Nominations Committee August 08, 2019 Meeting Minutes
- OHP September/October 2019 Meeting Calendar

November 2018

- Online Membership Application
- Co- Chair Discussion

Jan 2019

- Review Attendance and Take Appropriate Actions
- Recruitment for Spring 2019

Feb 2019

- Report Back on Members with Attendance Violations
- Nominations Activities: Social Planning

Mar 2019

- Spring 2019 Open Nominations

May 2019

- Nominations Activities: Social Planning
- Prevention Summit Tabling

June 2019

- Social Event

July 2019

- Debrief on Recruitment Activities--
- Review Membership Attendance--

Aug 2019

- Report Back on Attendance Violations
- Next Steps for Fall Open Nominations
- Attendance Violation Appeals

Sep 2019

- Open Nominations

