

MEETING AGENDA

Hybrid:

Thursday, September 10th, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (August 13th, 2026)
- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs
- ◆ Report of Staff
- ◆ Discussion Items
 - Review Application Language
 - Recruitment Strategies
 - HIPC Exit Survey
- ◆ Other Business
- ◆ Announcements
- ◆ Adjournment

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

The next Nominations Meeting is
October 8th, 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

HYBRID: Nominations Committee

Meeting Minutes of

Thursday, August 13th, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: T. Burroughs, D. D'Alessandro, J. Ealy, S. Heaven, S. Smith

Staff: Tiffany Dominique, Elizabeth Fischer, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh, Kristin Wilson

Call to Order: S. Heaven called the meeting to order at 12:57 p.m.

Introductions: S. Heaven asked for introductions. Everyone introduced themselves out loud.

Approval of Agenda:

S. Heaven referred to the August 2026 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** S. Smith motioned; T. Burroughs seconded to approve the August 2026 agenda. Those in the room voted by a show of hands. **Motion passed: 5 in favor.** The August 2026 Nominations Committee agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (May 14th, 2026):

S. Heaven referred to the May 2026 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** T. Burroughs motioned; S. Smith seconded to approve the May 2026 meeting minutes. Those in the room voted by a show of hands. **Motion passed: 4 in favor, 1 abstained.** The May 2026 Nominations Committee meeting minutes were approved.

Report of Co-chairs:

None.

Report of Staff:

None.

Action Item:

~Membership Application Review~

D. Law explained that this meeting's Open Nominations Review Panel was made up of the Nominations Committee and the Executive Committee. She explained that six members were required to be present to form a quorum. Since only 5 members were present, she reminded the group that a quorum of 5 was required to move forward. Afterward, they could review each membership application and vote to recommend applicants to the Mayor's office. J. Ealy asked for clarification of the process for reapplicants. D. Law said that during the review, the Review Panel could discuss each applicant. D. D'Alessandro asked for clarification of the quorum requirements. D. Law said that Nominations decided that there should be at least 6 members to form the Review Panel. She explained that when fewer than 6 members were present, the group

would vote to move forward if there were a sufficient number of members. If fewer than 3 members were present, they typically would not move forward with the process.

Motion: D. D'Alessandro motioned; J. Ealy seconded to continue the Application Review Panel with only five members in the quorum. Those in the room voted by show of hands. **Motion passed:** 4 in favor, 1 abstained. The process was approved to continue with a quorum of 5 members.

D. Law said there were 8 reapplicants, and if the group voted to move forward with all 8 reapplicants, they would be at 36 members. She showed the group what it would look like if the council was at its maximum with 55 members. She noted that each member could compare the demographics to see where gaps exist. She said the council had 6 members representing New Jersey, 4 members representing PA Counties, and 25 representing Philadelphia. D. Law said 4 members were rolling off due to term limits.

D. Law noted that the following categories were missing representation on the council: Substance Abuse, Affected Communities, State Medicaid (Part B), Formerly Incarcerated, or their representatives. The council was at 14% unaligned people with lived experience, and the requirement was 33%. HIPC's goal was to have 50% of people with lived experience aligned or unaligned.

T. Dominique asked if those numbers included those who were rolling off. D. Law responded that it included members who were reapplying, but did not include members who were rolling off. T. Burrough suggested creating a questionnaire that asked why members decided to resign. D. Law said a former member typically informed OHP staff of the reason why they had left. S. Moletteri added that this topic was normally a conversation between the member and OHP, not a formal survey. T. Dominique added that a leave of absence would typically be offered before resignation. T. Burroughs said creating a survey could help identify trends on why members were resigning. D. Law said there had been instances when members could not commit to the time requirements of HIPC due to their job responsibilities. T. Burroughs suggested finding a way to document the trends. T. Dominique said they could revisit that process after the review.

Applicant #180 received a score of 15. They were an unaligned PWH. The group decided to forward this applicant.

Applicant #182 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 14.2. T. Dominique noted that this person had inconsistent attendance due to career changes. They did communicate their absences before council meetings. T. Burrough asked how often the applicant missed meetings. T. Dominique said they typically attended every other meeting and made themselves available when specifically asked. S. Heaven said it's important for members to be realistic and honest about their ability to commit to the planning council. T. Burroughs suggested revisiting the applicant after considering the other applicants.

Applicant #178 received a score of 14. They were an unaligned PWH. T. Dominique said this person had been very active in coming to meetings and events despite not being a member. The group decided to forward this applicant.

Applicant #184 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 14. T. Dominique said they were engaged in the council. The group decided to forward this applicant.

Applicant #174 received a score of 13.8. They were an unaligned PWH. D. Law said this applicant had been very active in coming to meetings and Allocations. The group decided to forward this applicant.

Applicant #175 received a score of 13.8. They were an aligned PWH. The group moved forward with this applicant.

Applicant #177 received a score of 13.8. They were a former member of the council. S. Heaven asked how many members were already affiliated with this organization. D. Law said there was 1 standing member and 2 applicants with this affiliation. The HIPC had a cap of at most 2 members per affiliation. T. Burroughs asked if the standing member with this affiliation would be rolling off. D. Law said no. D. D'Alessandro asked if they could forward both applicants with the affiliation. S. Moletteri said typically there were only 2 from the same affiliation, but it was on a case-by-case basis. For example, the review panel may consider more than two applicants from the same affiliation if they are at the minimum number of council members. Another example was when an organization was large and multi-departmental, with representation from different areas. J. Ealy noted that Applicant #187 was reapplying to the council as a current standing member whereas Applicant #177 had served a full term, took a break, and was now reapplying. J. Ealy asked if only one of these applicants could move forward. D. Law said it was on a case-by-case basis. S. Moletteri added that since it was on a case-by-case basis, if the Review Panel felt one of the applicants met another demographic category that the council needed, they could discuss whether they would abide by the policy or not. S. Smith noted that Applicant #177 was a staff member at the affiliation. Applicant #187 represented a different organization but had the same affiliation as Applicant #177. The Review Panel decided to revisit this applicant.

Applicant #183 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 13.6. T. Dominique said this applicant attended meetings and was engaged. The group moved forward with this applicant.

Applicant #185 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 13. T. Dominique said this applicant attended meetings and was engaged. The group moved forward with this applicant.

Applicant #189 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 13. T. Dominique said this applicant had been on a leave of absence since almost the beginning of their membership. S. Moletteri said the applicant's attendance was not strong even before the leave of absence. The group said this applicant had valuable representation, but the attendance was an issue. The group did not move forward with this applicant.

Applicant #186 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 12.6. T. Dominique said this applicant attended meetings and was engaged. The group moved forward with this applicant.

Applicant #181 was reapplying for membership and received a score of 12.5. S. Heaven noted that this applicant would be the 4th member from this affiliation. T. Dominique said this applicant was very active within the council and had no attendance issues. T. Burrough asked for clarification on the number of members from this affiliation. D. Law said this was the 2nd member from the specific division within the organization. S. Moletteri said this affiliation was the majority of Part A services in New Jersey. T. Burroughs said that having too many members from one affiliation, even when they're in separate divisions, would constitute a large portion of the voting block. T. Dominique said that Applicant #181 had been on the council the longest compared to the other members with the affiliation. She noted that Applicant #181 was active in meetings before being formally appointed. She added that two members of this affiliation were recently appointed due to the wait time at the Mayor's office. The reason four members from this affiliation were put on the council was due to a lack of New Jersey representation. The group decided to move forward with this applicant.

Applicant #176 received a score of 10.4 and met the eligibility requirements. S. Smith said the application lacked sufficient information. T. Dominique said this applicant had not attended any meetings and had been "replacing" the person in that position a year ago. D. Law said there were two members representing Part D on the council. The group did not move forward with this applicant.

The group revisited Applicant #182, who was a reapplicant. J. Ealy mentioned that this applicant also had spotty attendance due to career changes. J. Ealy asked if they could approve, with some form of attendance support. D. Law said the Nominations Committee monitored attendance. S. Smith said the applicant represented populations that were heavily impacted by the epidemic, specifically the aging population. J. Ealy valued the unique perspective and demographic representation the applicant would bring. S. Smith asked what could be done to help the applicant improve their attendance. The group decided to go forward with Applicant #182 with attendance support.

D. D'Alessandro asked if attending virtually was still an option for meetings. The OHP staff said that most meetings were still virtual through Zoom. At every meeting, D. Law emailed all members who were not in attendance to remind them, and members like Applicant #182 sometimes joined after being reminded.

The group revisited #177 and #187, both of whom had the same affiliation. S. Smith asked what the affiliation was. T. Dominique said Applicant #177's affiliation was based on spouse and employment in the past, and Applicant #187's affiliation was current employment. D. Law reminded members that there was 1 standing member with this affiliation. J. Ealy asked if the options were to make an exception to allow both applicants or move forward with only one applicant. D. Law said that was up to the discretion of the Review Panel. D. Law said that if they moved forward with all the reapplicants, three unaligned applicants, and one aligned applicant, the council would be at 22% unaligned and 33% aligned, which moved them closer to their representation goal. D. Law clarified that the calculation included Applicant #187 since they were a reapplicant. T. Burroughs asked how adding both Applicant #177 and #187 would impact those numbers. D. Law responded that there would be roughly a 3-4% difference for unaligned representation if both applicants were on the council. T. Dominique said that after this round of

applicants, every applicant should be an unaligned PWH to meet the goal of 33%. The group decided to move forward with Applicant #187.

D. Law said another option would be holding off on moving an applicant forward until the next cycle, which the Review Panel had done in the past. She reminded them that there would still be a push only to appoint unaligned members after this applicant cycle. D. D'Alessandro asked if any other members sat on an HIV Planning Group (HPG). They found that one member sat on an HPG. S. Smith said she would not like to move forward with Applicant #177. J. Ealy said Applicant #177 was well qualified, but there were issues with the unaligned percentage and the number of members in the affiliation. J. Ealy asked if Applicant #177 represented the PA Counties. The group confirmed that they represented the PA Counties. T. Burroughs noted that Applicant #177 represents the PA Counties, but currently resides in New Jersey. D. D'Alessandro noted that Applicant #177 was an immigrant who spoke English as a second language. She asked whether HIPC already had that representation. The group noted that HIPC did have that representation. J. Ealy said that if a person received state and federal taxes from an organization in any way, the label "consultant" is questionable because they were still receiving income from the affiliation. The Review Panel had 2 votes against, 2 abstentions, and 1 vote in favor. The group did not move forward with Applicant #177.

S. Smith noted that Applicant #177 was affiliated with another organization, as indicated by an answer to a question on the application, though it was not listed among their affiliations. T. Burroughs highlighted that the applicant seemed knowledgeable. J. Ealy noted that they had been on HIPC before taking a gap year in their membership. The group did not move forward with Applicant #177. D. Law said OHP would ask the applicant to reapply or continue attending HIPC meetings. The group was favorable to that.

S. Moletteri noted that moving forward, the goal was to appoint unaligned PWH. J. Ealy said he was disappointed by the lack of applicants from the PA Counties and would take steps to recruit from those populations.

Motion: J. Ealy motioned, D. D'Alessandro seconded to recommend the following applicants for HIPC membership: Applicants #180, #182, #178, #184, #174, #175, #183, #185, #186, #181, #187.

T. Burroughs: In Favor
D. D'Alessandro: In Favor
J. Ealy: In Favor
S. Heaven: In Favor
S. Smith: In Favor

Motion passed: 5 in favor. Applicants #180, #182, #178, #184, #174, #175, #183, #185, #186, #181, and #187 were recommended for membership in HIPC.

Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

J. Ealy motioned; D. D'Alessandro seconded to adjourn the August 2026 Nominations Committee Meeting at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Fischer, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- August 2026 Nominations Committee Agenda
- May 2026 Nominations Committee Minutes