VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, June 11th, 2025
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th St., Suite 320, Philadelphia PA 19107

Present: Juan Baez (Co-Chair), Tariem Burroughs, Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Lupe Diaz, James Ealy, Ariaan Garcia, Sharee Heaven, Alecia Manley, Stacy Smith

Staff: Tiffany Dominique, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Mari Ross-Russell, Kevin Trinh

Call to Order: J. Baez called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

Introductions: J. Baez asked for introductions.

Approval of Agenda:
J. Baez referred to the June 2025 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned; L. Diaz seconded to approve the June 2025 agenda. **Motion passed:** 7 in favor 1 abstained. The June 2025 Nominations Committee agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (*April 10th, 2025 and May 8th*):
J. Baez referred to the April 2025 and May 2025 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** S. Smith motioned; S. Heaven seconded to approve the April 2025 and May 2025 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 5 in favor, 1 against, 2 abstained. The April 2025 and May 2025 Nominations Committee meeting minutes were approved.

Report of Co-chairs:
None.

Report of Staff:
None.

Discussion Items:
-Open Nominations Process-
D. Law reviewed the Open Nominations Process. An Open Nominations panel was to be composed of six members or more. If there were fewer than six members, the review panel would need to vote to accept a fewer number as a quorum. The review panel each individually scores the blinded applications for the HIV Integrated Planning Council based on how well they fulfill the criteria.

M. Cappuccilli said they encouraged applicants to write in as much detail as possible to reach a higher score. A. Manley asked if the veterans Nominations Committee members had reached out to the applicants to help them fill out the applications. D. Law replied that she had reached out to the applicants when they had sent in their application. If the member does not reply to her email,

she attempts to reach them through a phone call. D. Law had helped members fill out their applications when and as needed. For example, applicant #135 had trouble sending the application because they had issues with technology. D. Law welcomed any suggestions to accommodate potential candidates. M. Cappuccilli said they had spent significant time making the application as accessible as possible and could not understand why applicants would leave portions of the application blank. T. Burroughs suggested having short videos to help applicants to complete the forms. He said people learned differently and having an audio session could allow them to apply more easily. He also suggested having a fail-safe built into the application that would prevent the applicant from submitting the application without answering a certain question. J. Ealy suggested amending the application with the idea that applicants may use a proxy such as a case manager to answer questions. T. Dominique said the application has sections that do not allow applicants to move forward unless they answered certain questions. Applicants were allowed to return to the previous page but closing the browser would restart the application. M. Ross-Russell said they didn't save IP addresses because of privacy concerns. She said this had made it difficult for someone to return to complete an application.

Five scorecards were completed before the meeting. T. Burroughs suggested using an Excel feature to tally the score automatically. D. Law said she had to manually tally the cards because some members left a blank on their cards. Otherwise, the blank would default to 0 and skew the data. T. Dominique and Stacey asked what was the procedure if the committee member recognized an applicant. D. Law replied they didn't have language in the Bylaws concerning that situation. The language only stated that they would not score themselves if they saw their own application.

D. Law thanked the new members who had joined the meeting to help review the applications. M. Ross-Russell stated it had been decided at the last Executive Committee meeting that the new members would be allowed to help score the applications. She said the Executive Committee felt veteran members could help new members gain experience through this review process. M. Ross-Russell explained that the city tax clearance site had not worked in the past and an application was automatically deemed to be incomplete without the clearance. For several years to participate in a city board, a person needed to prove their water and property taxes were up to date. If a person rented, this didn't apply to them.

Motion: J. Baez motioned; A. Manley seconded to move forward with the voting process with five scorecards.

M. Cappuccilli: In Favor
S. Smith: In Favor
S. Heaven: In Favor
J. Baez: In Favor
J. Ealy: In Favor

Motion passed: 5 in favor. The Review Panel would move forward with the voting process with 5 scorecards and 8 members present.

D. Law said they previously had recommended limiting more than two members from the same organization. T. Dominique said they were previously concerned of creating voting blocks by having too many members from the same organization. It was decided they would not enforce this guideline because they were placing higher priority on recruiting more members. This guideline was not in the Bylaws. It was a recommendation created by the Nominations Committee to ensure fair representation.

The panel would review the applications based on the average score of each application. Applicant #144 was met with approval from the review panel members. J. Ealy said he had scored the member full marks on multiple areas M. Cappuccilli agreed the applicant had a strong record. The review panel decided the applicant would be recommended as a member to the Mayor's Office with 5 members in favor and 2 abstaining.

Applicant #134 had attended a subcommittee and HIPC meeting. The person was from NJ and was a Hispanic person with lived experience. M. Cappuccilli said they often had difficulty finding new applicants from PA suburbs and NJ counties. He said when they saw applicants from those regions, they usually were excited. The review panel voted to recommend the applicant to the Mayor's Office with 6 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

Application #138 was an African American person from the Health Federation. HIPC currently has two members from the Health Federation. J. Baez said adding another member from the Heath Federation would be acceptable since they were looking to expand their membership demographics. The review panel voted unanimously to recommend the applicant to the Mayor's Office as a member to HIPC.

Applicant #136 was an Asian Pacific Islander (API) who represented a RW Part D organization. The review panel appreciated that the applicant had represented RW Part D and had worked with youth. They felt that the applicant could bring a unique perspective by working with youth. All 8 members recommended the application for placement to HIPC.

Applicant #147 was an API who represented Cooper. M. Cappuccilli felt the person had submitted a good personal statement. T. Dominique said the review panel should consider if the members were different from each other if they represented the same organization. She said Cooper was a large organization and two people could specialize in entirely separate fields. The review panel had agreed with this idea and voted to recommend the applicant for membership to HIPC. Seven members voted in favor. One member abstained.

Applicant #139 was a person representing the University of Pennsylvania and had attended one HIPC meeting. The member had wanted more say in how funding was spent. The review panel quickly voted with seven members voting in favor and one member abstaining.

Applicant #142 was from the Mazzoni Center. M. Cappuccilli said the person had a good personal statement. He asked if they had someone representingMazzoni Center. A. Manley believed they had two representatives from the Mazzoni Center with one of the members reaching their term limit soon. The review panel voted on the application. The results were 6 members in favor, 1 member against, and 1 member abstained.

Applicant #135 had a score of 11.5, which was an average score. The applicant had left many of the questions blank. D. Law said the person was technologically challenged and had recently moved from a different country. She said this member would need a mentor to guide them. The applicant was a consumer and had knowledge of another planning body. The panel voted to recommend the applicant with 7 in favor and 1 abstaining.

Applicant #140 had skipped many of the questions but did submit a personal statement. The review panel quickly scanned through the application and because the individual had harm reduction experience the panel decided to recommend the applicant with 8 votes in favor.

Applicant #143 had a score of 11. The applicant had stopped answering questions after question #15. The review panel members felt uneasy with the lack of information provided. D. Law had attempted to reach the applicant through email and the phone. The review panel had decided against recommending the applicant with 5 members voting, 2 members abstaining and 1 member in favor for recommending the applicant for membership. J. Baez asked if rejected applications were recorded. D. Law confirmed they were recorded to prevent multiple applications.

Applicant #145 representing the Mazzoni Center had a score of 9. The applicant was a case manager and had skipped much of the questions. The application was completed up to question #26. The review panel were wary of adding another person representing the Mazzoni Center and were more unfavorable towards this application because it was incomplete. The review panel voted against recommendation with 7 votes against and 1 vote abstaining.

Applicant #146 had an incomplete application and didn't have an occupation. D. Law had contacted the person and had invited them to their June HIPC meeting. She had not received a response yet. L. Diaz said the member was a person with lived experience and was unaligned. J. Baez was in favor of recommendation since the person had lived experience and was unaligned. He was concerned the applicant would not be an active and engaged member. The review panel voted to recommend the applicant with 4 members voting in favor, 1 member against and 1 member abstaining.

Applicant #137 had an incomplete application. D. Law and M. Ross-Russell had attempted to reach the person but had not received a response. The applicant had lived experience. The review panel voted against recommendation with 1 member in favor and 4 members voting against.

Applicant #133 was from Quakertown. The applicant had lived experience. The review panel voted against recommendation with 5 members voting against and 3 members voting in favor.

The review panel concluded their Open Nominations Process. They had recommended 10 out of 14 applicants for HIPC membership. With the 9 applicants, the membership numbers would be bolstered to 45 total members. The maximum number of HIPC members was 55. Next September, about 6 members would be reaching their term limits.

Other Business:
None.

Announcements:
None.

Adjournment:
J. Baez called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned; J. Ealy seconded to adjourn the June 2025 Nominations Committee meeting. **Motion passed:** Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- June 2025 Nominations Committee Agenda
- May 2025 Nominations Committee Minutes
- April 2025 Nominations Committee Minutes