

Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Monday, December 14, 2020
2:00-4:00p.m.

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

Present: Daniel Angelis, Juan Baez, Michael Cappuccilli, Sharee Heaven, Sam Romero

Staff: Beth Celeste, Debbie Law, Mari Ross-Russell, Sofia Moletteri

Call to Order: M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and asked for everyone to introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda: M. Cappuccilli presented the December 2020 Nominations Committee agenda for approval. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, S. Romero seconded to approve the December 2020 agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes (*November 23, 2020*): M. Cappuccilli presented the previous meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion:** J. Baez motioned, S. Romero seconded to approve the November 2020 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Report of Staff:

No report.

Report of Chair:

M. Cappuccilli reported that the Recruitment and Retention Learning Collaborative for Part A across the country has approved Philadelphia HIPC's team of which he was a part. There would be five or six hour and a half sessions starting in February 2021. He would report back to Nominations Committee with any Recruitment and Retention LC updates.

Discussion Items:

—Committee Structure—

M. Ross-Russell explained that the purpose, which has been discussed in all other committee meetings as well, is to figure out the balance and proper distribution of HIPC tasks amongst the committees. This may also increase participation with clear goals from each committee. Thus far, Finance Committee has decided to take on the Priority Setting process which was initially assigned to CPC. CPC can finish up review of Integrated Plan before moving into the new Integrated Plan and Consumer Survey.

M. Ross-Russell mentioned that during past discussions, there were conversations around including ad-hoc, population-based workgroups. This way, population groups could act as a mechanism to get members to participate or interested individuals to join. Individuals actively participating in ad-hoc population workgroups could then have the HIPC process opened up to them without having to be members.

S. Moletteri mentioned that within the Executive Committee, there was discussion around this committee taking over or participating in some Nominations Committee obligations. This would include the Nominations Committee “nominations process.” Within the last Nominations Committee meeting, the committee also discussed taking on more responsibility around recruitment, retention, and community engagement. She recalled that L. Diaz, within the last meeting, also voiced concern around how Nominations Committee would operate if there were a structure change and the committee focused more heavily on community engagement. The committee, she explained, might have a change in membership. S. Moletteri also explained that the committee discussed in detail that community engagement was currently on the “backburner” and it may be beneficial to focus more heavily on this within HIPC.

M. Cappuccilli agreed, explaining that within other EMAs, it seemed as if recruitment and retention was given more of a priority. He felt that Nominations Committee does not see recruitment and retention as their primary goal and focus, so they should discuss how to delegate this work within the committee structures. The other issue, he explained, was the process of reviewing attendance and applications which could be sorted out in both Executive and Nominations Committees. He asked if this process could easily be shared between two committees.

M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law whether the applications process could be spread out between committees. D. Law said that within the open nominations process, the panel to review applications is a panel of six HIPC members consisting of PLWHA and active/participating members. In the past, she noted that the panel has either consisted of just Nominations Committee members, or in some application cycles, members outside of Nominations were also recruited to participate. M. Cappuccilli said the committee is always trying to recruit people onto the review panel, but it usually just consists of Nominations members. D. Law agreed and said there is not typically consistency with members outside of Nominations on the panel.

M. Cappuccilli asked the rest of the committee what they thought about Executive Committee sharing the review panel work. D. Law said she spoke to L. Diaz before the meeting, and L. Diaz said that she joined Nominations because of her work schedule. She felt that outreach and other recruitment responsibilities may end up being more time consuming and unmanageable with her other work. J. Baez agreed with L. Diaz. He asked what “outreach” would look like. He felt that their outreach with consumers has not been very successful in the past and that Nominations Committee would not be the right fit for recruitment unless Nominations membership was revamped and more consumer-driven. J. Baez felt as if he would not be a good fit for Nominations Committee if they were headed towards a structure that involved more recruitment/engagement responsibilities.

M. Ross-Russell said that this was a way that they could talk about what they can improve what they do. Instead of looking at how this acts as an outreach mechanism, they can employ other techniques to try to recruit people to participate. In other words, in addition to in-person recruitment, there are also other methods for recruitment that may not be as time-consuming. For example, M. Ross-Russell noted that the office was working on the website in order to better reach the community and give a full explanation of the Planning Council. They were also considering putting short videos on the website for those who may be interested. She explained that the Planning Council members and Nominations members are busy individuals, so the office was interested in hearing how they could better support the council when needed.

S. Moletteri explained that the office was talking about splitting up the About pages for OHP and HIPC. This will help potential members understand the difference between OHP support staff and

HIPC volunteers/members. S. Moletteri noted that there were HIPC members who volunteered to talk for video blurbs on the website to help explain Planning Council. She also noted that she was also going to start working on an animation that was approximately two or so minutes to help describe Planning Council roles, responsibilities, demographics, etc. The goal was to make HIPC responsibilities clear, HIPC more accessible, and individuals more comfortable with participating.

M. Ross-Russell added that within the community, there are a lot of individuals that have no idea who is on the Planning Council. It should be made clear to people that this body is made up of community members who are both providers and 1/3 of PLWH. The HIPC is rare and the only body in existence that is federally funded that provides input into what the services should look like. It is also possible, she explained, to work with the city and their media experts to ensure what information is getting out there. She explained that OHP has Facebook and Instagram and that these can be utilized to their full capabilities to try to expand what is essentially HIPC PR.

M. Ross-Russell explained that HIPC, Executive, and Nominations all discussed a hybrid of meetings that are both in-person and virtual. For people who cannot physically make it to meetings, they can still participate virtually. These are ideas that are being bounced around to encourage participation and help with retention and recruitment.

S. Romero said that the council and committees may be a bit stuck in how they are and how they operate. He felt that the virtual world can be used as an opportunity to help transition to what comes after this time period. He felt that young people may be more inclined to participate if the meetings were also available virtually. S. Romero mentioned that one of the new, recommended members attended the last HIPC meeting. Luckily, this member knew S. Romero and was able to text him to ask any questions. However, in other circumstances, S. Romero felt that there needed to be a better avenue for new or interested members to introduce themselves or be able to ask questions.

S. Romero felt that the council missed an opportunity to better engage the new members. He said that they should smooth out the transition period to better the meetings. He considered using the chat room to assist with new members and answer questions as a “sidebar.” Given that they use Robert’s Rules, the structure might seem rigid, but they should still find ways to make it clear to new members that the content and them, as participants, are most important, and the structure just helps to guide them. He asked that they think about how the virtual aspect of this new world, how it can lend itself to better recruitment and retention.

M. Ross-Russell explained that when she went to other EMAs, almost every other EMA also uses a version of Robert’s Rules. She said that they already use a looser version of Robert’s Rules to try to make the meeting more approachable. Having a FAQ or more information on the website could also help new members who have questions.

M. Cappuccilli asked if, virtually, they could have older members buddy up with new members. Virtual meetings make connections harder, so having a sub meeting after the main meeting or assigned buddies to chat during the meetings could help. S. Romero agreed with M. Cappuccilli. M. Ross-Russell said that they can look into ways to help people communicate with each other during the process. J. Baez agreed with the buddying up of new members. He added that they could even buddy up current members who still need help with the process. Buddies could always be reassigned if there seems to be a better fit within the larger body.

D. Law asked if the committee wants to further discuss how to better their current process or if they want to focus on how they want to revamp the structure entirely. M. Ross-Russell noted that Nominations Committee has not yet talked about their structure in depth like the other committees had. Therefore, this conversation is about both structure *and* bettering the current process. Given that they have been Nominations members for a while, they will know best about what they should consider taking on (for structure change) or what should be enhanced.

S. Romero said that Nominations does not have a perfect overlap with recruitment. The role of Nominations, thus far, works well with retention. Recruitment, he felt, would take much more work and a different type of expertise. Other EMAs have recruitment as a bigger piece of their structure, so integrating recruitment into Nominations current structure may not do justice to the importance of recruitment work. This may need to be a broader effort from the whole council.

M. Cappuccilli said that the core of Nominations mission is to do what they do best: application, retention, attendance, and reaching out to members. This may mean that recruitment and retention be separated. For the nationwide LC around recruitment and retention, M. Cappuccilli suggested making this a part of the Planning Council meetings. For example, within the Planning Council, those attending the LC can lead a discussion each month to report what they have learned at the LC. Reports could start early in the year of 2021 in February and can be used as a way to jumpstart the discussion of recruitment within HIPC.

S. Romero said that during their last social, they had some interested younger individuals attend the social and stick around for two or three meetings after that. S. Romero said it was important to look into why these individuals did not stay longer. M. Cappuccilli agreed and highlighted the importance of recruitment and how it is a large issue that Nominations should start to look further into. J. Baez said that they should look at why people want to join and what barriers and obstacles caused people to stop coming.

D. Angelis said that—regarding why people come to the Planning Council meetings—he felt that people, especially HIV positive individuals attend for a sense of inclusion with members and within the service system. However, being on the council for a period of time, he felt that people may not feel heard, especially when they are passionate about an issue. He also mentioned that patients and providers may sometimes butt heads, with providers sometimes dismissive to HIV+ members. D. Angelis also mentioned that those who have to work during the day may not be able to attend meetings. Therefore, time of day for meetings may be an extra barrier to attendance and retention.

D. Angelis added that when discussing retention, some participants may have a lot to deal with or are dealing with their mental health. Therefore, participants want to be involved in meetings but have these obstacles. He suggested calling members who have fallen out of touch to ask how they are and provide support if needed.

D. Angelis also mentioned that he was not included during the open nominations process. He suggested that occurrences like these may make participants feel left out. D. Law explained that there was a confidentiality agreement that all open nominations participants had to sign—sent via email—before receiving the password protected applications. Since they were reviewing applicants' personal information online due to COVID-19 restrictions, OHP took extra precautions to ensure everyone's information was safe and secure online and within the Nominations panel. J. Baez said that in the future, the Nominations Committee should work to make sure they are communicating with other members properly.

D. Law said that the Nominations seems to want to enhance retention capabilities. M. Cappuccilli said that regarding retention, the panel which is for Nominations, they should call as many people as they can to make sure those who want to be part of the panel have the opportunity to do so. J. Baez said that Nominations Committee can do the work for recruiting people to the panel.

S. Moletteri said that she is hearing that Nominations does not want to take on recruitment, and they want to take on retention responsibilities and focus on barriers and obstacles to participating within HIPC. S. Moletteri asked if this is the direction that Nominations wants to take for their future structure. J. Baez added that Nominations wants to still be part of recruitment in a sense, but this should be a larger, Planning Council effort. Recruitment deals with reaching the maximum number of members, and they should especially be reaching PLWHA.

S. Romero said that Nominations could be more proactive in reaching out to individuals and following up with members/making connections with existing members.

—Current Membership and Virtual Attendance—

Looking at the charts, D. Law noted that there were four charts. The first chart represented the total number of current members after having removed the three members last meeting. The second chart represented ideal membership. The third chart showed the current membership with the 12 new recommended members. This came out to 47 members with 25% of members as unaligned consumers with 32% members being PLWHA.

In the last meeting, they discussed members with attendance violation and how they should discuss this further. Due to the virtual nature of meetings, they voiced how they wanted to go about this process differently due to added barriers. J. Baez said that they have to learn what barriers members are facing, so they should reach out to them. He said that he would be willing to call individuals to discuss barriers, technological or otherwise. He could also clarify with members that they do not have to have internet access or a camera to participate in Zoom and can participate via phone call.

M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law how attendance has changed since they last reviewed it. D. Law responded that they still had to look through and gather attendance from the Zoom meetings. During the last Executive Committee meeting, they reviewed the list of those with the attendance violations. Some of those with attendance violation are providers and some are consumers. As for the providers, they could not be contacted, and therefore, Nominations Committee chose to remove these members.

D. Law mentioned that there are more non-members than members who come to meetings nowadays due to the virtual nature of the meetings. D. Law said that some people who have not attended meetings virtually were also not attending when the meetings were in person. However, there has definitely been a drop-off in consumer attendance. N. Johns has reached out to some consumer members. M. Cappuccilli said that they could compile a list and the Nominations Committee could reach out to people. D. Law said that staff could go through all the meetings and create a list to present to Nominations Committee. D. Angelis said that he could also call individuals on the list.

M. Cappuccilli asked that, as a committee, if they could meet before Planning Council meetings going forward. D. Law said they can work on deciding a set meeting date if they would like. M. Cappuccilli asked if they could meet at 12:00 p.m., just as they had before the virtual setting. S. Moletteri said that they could continue to meet at 12:00 p.m. before HIPC meeting dates or they

could decide a new date via Doodle poll. M. Cappuccilli said that meeting right before HIPC was opportunistic so they could have the chance to follow up with members right away that were discussed in Nominations Committee.

D. Law said that they could distribute the list of members who have fallen off during the next meeting. M. Cappuccilli and J. Baez said that if the list was available, it could also be distributed before the next meeting via email. D. Law said that she would talk on staff's end to work this out.

—Recommended Members—

D. Law explained that during panel, they put three members on “recommendations with contingencies” due to tax clearance issues. D. Law said she followed up with the members who were contingent on receiving the tax clearances. Only one of the recommended members responded to her.

J. Baez explained that getting the tax clearance is not as difficult as people anticipate. He said that he would be willing to help people out with the tax clearances, and he could find a way to offer people his help and, with their permission, fill out the tax clearances for them. He added that if people have a tax barrier and are not cleared, he could work with them and refer them to AIDS Law.

M. Ross-Russell added that there is a misunderstanding about why tax clearances are needed. She said that many individuals do not know the background about why this is requested and do not know it is a requirement of the mayor's office. She thought that this explanation might help ease the barrier for some people who would like to know background on the tax clearance before filling it out.

D. Angelis said that when he applied for HIPC, he had never attended a meeting before. He only had the information on the website, and it was unclear as to why the tax clearance was needed. He agreed that it would be beneficial to have more information on the tax clearance and application process within the website. M. Ross-Russell said that they could also add a number for people to call to ask questions about the application, HIPC, and/or tax certification. J. Baez suggested M. Ross-Russell set up a Google number.

M. Cappuccilli asked what explanation for the certification they currently provide on the application. D. Law explained that the application states that the certification is required from the mayor's office. M. Ross-Russell noted that the explanation could be lengthened, including that any recognized committee for the city requires all members to have a tax clearance. This detail could be beneficial.

J. Baez reiterated that if people have not filled out their tax clearance, they can contact him and he can help them. He added that within the last HIPC meeting, he sent out resources within the Zoom chat for anyone having trouble with the tax clearance portion of the application. D. Law said that the two individuals who had not given their tax clearances or responded to her email had never attended a meeting. They are also recent applicants. She said that she would give J. Baez the names and numbers so he could call and assist them.

S. Romero asked what the verdict was with a current member and the applicant who wanted to take over their position within the council. D. Law asked if the current member wanted to resign. Even if they do resign, D. Law explained, the application cycle was over, and the new applicant who wanted to take their place would have to wait until the next round. S. Romero asked if this could be made clear to both the applicant and the current member. D. Law reminded everyone in the committee that

they could not accept this applicant, because the council would then have three people from the same organization.

M. Cappuccilli asked if by the next meeting, they would have the final numbers—including recommended numbers—to report to the council. D. Law said they would. She once again pointed out the membership charts, highlight the third and fourth charts. She explained that these were breakdowns of demographics. The third includes the 12 new applicants, and the fourth chart includes only 10 new applicants, excluding applicants who did not receive tax certifications.

M. Cappuccilli pointed out that it may be confusing for people to come to meetings without letting them know about their application status. He asked if they could make it clearer to applicants that they have or have not been recommended. S. Romero asked if they could be more proactive in the HIPC agenda to leave space for new members in the beginning of the meetings. This could help welcome members and help people communicate to each other. S. Heaven said that they could do this after introductions, to specifically welcome new members. S. Romero agreed and said that they could even ask people if they are at a HIPC meeting for the first time and allow them to speak during this space if they would like. He suggested adding a phone number and letting people know they can use the chat if they have questions. M. Ross-Russell said she could start her Google phone account and provide that number for any questions.

Any Other Business:

D. Law wished everyone a Happy New Year.

S. Heaven asked if recruitment was going to be brought to Executive Committee. M. Ross-Russell said that they would likely approach this as part of the committee report for HIPC, but recruitment is the responsibility of the whole Planning Council. This may also be talked about within Executive Committee. M. Cappuccilli said that the LC could be a regular report within the Planning Council.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment: M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, J. Baez seconded to adjourn the December 14, 2020 Nominations Committee meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed:

- December 2020 Nominations Committee Agenda
- November 2020 Nominations Committee Meeting Minutes
- November 2020 Demographics