

MEETING AGENDA

Hybrid:

Thursday, August 13th, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (May 14th, 2026)
- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs
- ◆ Report of Staff
- ◆ Action Items
 - Membership Application Review
- ◆ Other Business
- ◆ Announcements
- ◆ Adjournment

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

The next Nominations Meeting is
September 10th, 2026 at 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA

19107 (215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

HYBRID: Nominations Committee

Meeting Minutes of

Thursday, May 14th, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: J. Baez (Co-Chair), T. Burroughs, S. Heaven, P. Neumann, S. Smith

Staff: Tiffany Dominique, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh

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

Introductions: J. Baez asked for introductions. Those on Zoom introduced themselves via the chat, and those in person introduced themselves verbally.

Approval of Agenda:

J. Baez referred to the May 2026 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** J. Baez motioned; S. Heaven seconded to approve the May 2026 agenda. **A poll was launched, and those in the room voted by show of hands.** **Motion passed:** All in favor. The May 2026 Nominations Committee agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (April 19th, 2026):

J. Baez referred to the April 2026 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** S. Smith motioned; J. Baez seconded to approve the April 2026 meeting minutes. **A poll was launched, and those in the room voted by show of hands and through the Zoom poll.** **Motion passed:** 3 in favor, 1 abstained. The April 2026 Nominations Committee meeting minutes were approved.

Report of Co-chairs:

None.

Report of Staff:

D. Law provided an update on the five people who hadn't released their information. Of the five people, the Office of HIV Planning (OHP) staff were able to contact three, who released their information to the city. The OHP staff were unable to contact the remaining two applicants. T. Dominique said one of the applicants had a working telephone number, and the other had a full voicemail box.

D. Law noted there were two applicants who were unaligned PWH, which would help with HIPC reflectiveness. T. Burroughs said he hoped these applicants would be active participants in the planning council. One Applicant attended a HIPC meeting in June 2025 and hasn't attended one since. D. Law said she had contacted them in December 2025. The applicant was using their friend's email and may have inconsistent internet access. J. Baez said HIPC members needed to be accessible in their communication. He wanted members who would participate. He suggested a deadline of 30 days. If the applicants could not be contacted or refused to release their information by then, they would be removed from HIPC. T. Burroughs agreed with J. Baez and

emphasized that they needed to utilize their time wisely as a committee. The committee members agreed they would move forward with this decision.

Discussion Items:

~Orientation~

The New Member Orientation was scheduled for June 4th. Typically, the co-chairs attended the Orientation to recruit for their committees. The Orientation would be in person and take place between 11 am and 2 pm. Afterward, the members can elect to attend the Finance Committee. D. Law said another idea was to have posters that the new members could look at during their breaks. The posters would describe each committee. J. Baez said this was a good idea.

Lunch would be served at the Orientation. D. Law asked each person to email her with their food preferences and dietary restrictions. At this time, 10 people had replied to D. Law's email with their preferences. Two members had replied that they were not attending. D. Law asked the Nominations Committee to decide the outcome for absences at the Orientation. T. Burroughs said it was a difficult conversation without a clear-cut answer. If a new member had a prior engagement or a life event, such as a graduation/hospital stay, they would need to excuse that person. If the new member had confirmed their attendance or was not responding to emails, it was a different conversation. D. Law said they had a few options they could implement since they understood not everyone could attend Orientation in-person. One option was to have the new member watch a recording of the Orientation, which would count as attending. Another option was to allow the new member to delay their Orientation until the following season, when Orientation would be held again. A third option was a one-on-one with an OHP staff member to debrief on the Orientation.

J. Baez asked what their contingency plan was if a new member decided to forgo all the options listed above. D. Law replied they would forward the member's case to the Nominations Committee to decide on a case-by-case basis. J. Baez asked how many people had not responded to D. Law about Orientation. D. Law replied that about 10 people had not responded back to her, but she needed to check her email to ensure this number was accurate. J. Baez was concerned about the large number of people who would not be in compliance if the remaining members didn't respond.

Returning to the video recording as an option for Orientation, J. Baez asked how they would hold people accountable if they chose it. He wondered whether they would rely solely on an honor system to confirm that they had attended Orientation. T. Dominique said they could test the new members. J. Baez wondered how stringent they had to be with the test.

T. Dominique asked whether attending the "mini-Orientation" back in October 2025 was sufficient to meet the requirements. She said the new members may feel they know everything at the Orientation since most members had been attending for one year. P. Neumann asked if the June 4th Orientation would be the same as the mini-Orientation. D. Law said it would be more in-depth and personal. J. Baez and the other committee members agreed that if a person attended the mini-Orientation, they would be meeting HRSA requirements. The committee members believed that forcing members to do another Orientation would make them feel like their time was not valued. Regarding new members who had not attended the mini-Orientation, J. Baez

said people would be more likely to attend Orientation if they were reminded that it was an HRSA requirement.

D. Law asked if they should give the new members a Zoom link for the Orientation. J. Baez said they should give the link but only as a last resort. He believed that they should give people as few options as possible to funnel them towards attending the Orientation. The committee decided that if they were unable to contact a new member, no further action would be taken if the member attended the mini-Orientation. T. Burroughs applauded the idea as a way to reduce redundancy and to show they valued the newly appointed members.

T. Dominique asked whether the committee wanted to standardize the Orientation date to two predetermined dates. She said it would relieve some of the burden of the co-chairs if they had a predetermined date to plan their schedules around. J. Baez said choosing a date was a good idea. The committee members did not provide further feedback. They would revisit this topic in a future meeting.

~Survey~

K. Trinh said that HIPC and the Nominations Committee had been requesting a meeting survey for some time. The survey had started out as a way to evaluate and improve the HIPC meeting. Eventually, the survey shifted towards gauging recommended members' feelings about the meetings and the events they wanted to see in the future. The survey would be expanded to include all members. The survey would ask the members to evaluate the meeting and to suggest events they would like to see in the future. J. Baez said the survey content looked good. K. Trinh asked him whether he wanted to send the survey after every meeting or quarterly. J. Baez said that since subcommittees were smaller and more intimate, they would not need to survey them. T. Dominique asked if they could send out the survey at the HIPC meeting later today. The committee expressed permission to do so.

D. Law asked what they should do with the survey results. T. Dominique asked whether the Nominations Committee wanted to review the survey or should leave the task to the Executive Committee. J. Baez said he believed they should review the survey since improving the member and meeting experience was one of their functions. D. Law asked if they would send surveys indefinitely or if they were surveying for a set period of time. J. Baez said he wanted to gauge members' reactions to the survey before making any additional decisions. The committee suggested adding a box to determine if the survey respondent was attending in person or virtually.

J. Baez asked if recommended members would be approved earlier. T. Dominique said they had heard that the city government's slow response was due to the previous administration's policy. The new administration would be drafting a new policy regarding the recommended members and hoped to expedite the process.

Other Business:

T. Dominique said they had tabled at the Aging and Thriving event on May 5th. They would table at the CFAR Clinical Trial event on Saturday. On June 6th, they would table at the Temple Wellness Event.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

J. Baez adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- May 2026 Nominations Committee Agenda
- April 2026 Nominations Committee Minutes

DRAFT