

**Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, March 14, 2019
12:00-2:00 p.m.**

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

Present: Juan Baez, Michael Cappuccilli, Sharee Heaven, Lupe Diaz, Samuel Romero, Gloria Taylor

Absent: Steven Zick

Staff: Dustin Fitzpatrick, Debbie Law

Call to Order/Introductions:

S. Romero called the meeting to order at 12:25 p.m. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

S. Romero presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli moved, L. Diaz seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes (February 14, 2019):

S. Romero presented the minutes for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, S. Romero seconded to approve the February 14, 2019 minutes. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Co-Chair:

None.

Report of Staff:

D. Law stated that she had a follow-up from the last meeting. She stated that J. Baez had contacted two members regarding their attendance. J. Baez stated that he had contacted one member who had been unable to attend due to a conflict, although he had not spoken with this member directly yet. He noted that the other member had said that he would attend the HIPC meeting later that day. M. Cappuccilli asked if the member he had contacted had come to the last HIPC meeting, and D. Law agreed. L. Diaz stated that she had not heard back from her contacts.

Action Item:

Open Nominations Process

D. Law reminded the group that the Planning Council process for review applications required a review panel of at least six members. Noting that five members were currently present, she asked the group if they would like to vote to waive the requirement for this round. L. Diaz noted that S. Heaven would be coming to the meeting, although she had not arrived yet, and suggested that they start with five members since they would ultimately have six members.

D. Law explained that the nominations process happened twice each year, and that applications were blinded. She next stated that there were seventeen Planning Council

applications for review during the current meeting, including applications from nine current members. She explained that twelve Planning Council members had expiring terms, but only nine were reapplying, so three would be rolling off.

D. Law informed those present that the application process included a comparison of current Planning Council membership to the idea demographic breakdown. She explained that they did this in order to identify gaps on the HIPC. She noted that they currently had 41 members. She then stated that current demographic gaps included African-Americans, members from the PA Counties, and members from Philadelphia. She pointed out that there was a particular gap in the PA Counties, since two HIPC members that previously lived in the PA Counties had moved to Philadelphia. She stated that they also needed more male HIPC members.

D. Law next noted that representation gaps included on substance abuse service providers, non-elected community leaders, and Part D. She added that HRSA asked planning councils to include fifteen different representation categories.

M. Cappuccilli explained that they used a four-point system to score HIPC applicants based on several different criteria. He went on to say that applicants who provided little information typically scored lower. He stated that each panel member would score the applications individually, and that D. Law would then tabulate the totals when individual scoring was complete. He noted that they would occasionally ask D. Law for additional information about an applicant while scoring, such as what their past attendance was like. He added that panel members did not score their own applications.

The group then broke to score the applications individually.

M. Cappuccilli asked if any of the reapplying Planning Council members had attendance issues. D. Law replied that there were applicants who had been contacted every cycle regarding their attendance. L. Diaz asked for assistance in reading application #108.

G. Taylor asked about the “clarity of contribution” criterion. M. Cappuccilli replied that this was often assessed through an applicant’s written responses. He explained that some applications only provided their basic demographic information but did not respond to any of the open-ended questions, so their “clarity of contribution” scores were low. G. Taylor then referred to the “understands the Planning Council” criterion, asking if this would be higher for current Planning Council members. The group agreed. L. Diaz added that she looks to the question about why the applicant wants to be a Planning Council member to assess the level of understanding for a new applicant.

M. Cappuccilli asked if any of the applicants had problems with the tax clearances from the City of Philadelphia. D. Law replied that some applicants did not include their clearances.

D. Law noted that she had invited six of the new applicants to attend the Planning Council meeting, and that two had responded. She noted that #110 had not submitted their tax clearance.

L. Diaz asked for more information about #111. D. Law replied that this applicant sometimes attended the Positive Committee, and was not a current member. She noted that this person may have attendance issues.

M. Cappuccilli asked if #110 had attended any meetings. D. Law replied that she was not sure, and that she had asked applicants to introduce themselves to staff if they attended a meeting. She noted that applicants might not do this if they already knew another staff member.

D. Law noted that #115 had submitted an incomplete application because they had skipped many questions and did not submit their tax clearance. J. Baez asked if there was a way for applicants to ask for help, and D. Law replied that this was included in the application.

The group then discussed the limit on having only two members from an individual organization.

M. Cappuccilli asked how they should handle incomplete application #117, and asked how it was determined that an application was incomplete. D. Law replied that this would refer to an online application that was not finished. She noted that this application did not include the clearance.

J. Baez noted that he would often give applicants the benefit of the doubt if their clarity of contribution was low, but their representation score was high. He explained that they were often looking for consumers to contribute based on their experiences rather than professional skills. M. Cappuccilli agreed.

The group then broke while D. Law tallied scores. Once D. Law returned, she explained that she put the scores in an Excel spreadsheet that calculates totals and averages. She noted that numbers with asterisks represented applications where a person had recused themselves from scoring, so only five numbers were included.

The results follow:

- 102 – recommended
- 103 – recommended
- 104 – recommended
- 107 – recommended
- 110 – recommended (pending tax clearance)
- 106 – recommended
- 105 – recommended
- 101 – recommended
 - The group noted that 116 had had repeat attendance issues.
- 116 – recommended
- 113 – recommended
 - The group discussed the number of people from this applicant 116's agency. L. Diaz asked if they could get a list of the number of members from each agency as they reviewed applications. D. Law replied that this may be difficult, because members change agencies without notifying OHP. She noted that a previous member from this agency had left the Planning Council, and S. Romero added that another person from this agency had also left.

- 112 – recommended
- 117 – recommended
 - The group discussed this applicant’s representation. D. Law noted that this new applicant had been attending meetings, and would push the percentage of Planning Council members from New Jersey up to 18%. The group agreed that this applicant would provide an important perspective.
- 114 – not recommended
 - D. Law stated that this applicant had said that they were a former Planning Council member, but they had not been on the Planning Council before. The group agreed not to recommend this application since it was mostly incomplete.
- 108 – recommended
- 109 – recommended
- 111 – recommended
 - L. Diaz noted that there was a lack of information on the application. She asked if this person had been to the Planning Council before. D. Law replied that this person had participated on the Positive Committee.
- 115 – recommended (pending tax clearance)
 - D. Law stated that she had not met this applicant. J. Baez noted that this application had been marked incomplete. M. Cappuccilli noted that this application was not missing a significant amount of information. J. Baez noted that this applicant’s work experience would fill a gap on the Planning Council.

Discussion Item:

None.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

None.

Announcements:

D. Law announced that new member orientation would be held the next month.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 1:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dustin Fitzpatrick and Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from February 14, 2019
- HIPC Applications (not scanned)
- OHP Calendar