MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL: Thursday, December 8, 2022 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- Call to Order
- Welcome/Introductions
- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes (August 11, 2022)
- Report of Co-Chairs
- Report of Staff
- Discussion Item
 - o Review Membership Bylaws/Open Nominations Process
 - o Increasing Engagement for Orientation
- Other Business
- ♦ Announcements
- Adjournment

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

The next Nominations Committee meeting is **VIRTUAL: January 12, 2023** from 1**2:00 – 2:00 р.m.** Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12^{тн} Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107 *(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org*

VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee Meeting Minutes of Thursday, August 11, 2022 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: Juan Baez, Lupe Diaz, Sharee Heaven

Staff: Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri

Call to Order: S. Heaven offered to chair and called the meeting to order at 12:16 p.m.

Introductions: S. Heaven asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

S. Heaven referred to the August 2022 Nominations agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned; S. Heaven seconded to approve the August 2022 Nominations agenda. **Motion passed:** all in favor. The August 2022 agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (June 9, 2022):

S. Heaven referred to the June 2022 Nominations minutes. <u>Motion: L. Diaz motioned; S.</u> <u>Heaven seconded to approve the June 2022 meeting minutes via a Zoom poll. Motion passed:</u> <u>all in favor.</u> The June 2022 minutes were approved.

Report of Co-Chairs:

The co-chairs were not present so there was no report.

Report of Staff:

S. Moletteri asked if they would once again have the new members stay on for questions and comments after the HIPC meeting today. They did this for the first time in June as suggested by the Nominations Committee. L. Diaz suggested they do this again. S. Heaven agreed, noting that they should offer this bimonthly.

D. Law reported that the Community Planning Support Coordinator position was now vacant and there were only four individuals on staff for OHP. S. Heaven asked if there was a positing for the position yet. D. Law responded that the office was understaffed, so they had not yet gotten to it.

Discussion Items:

-Report Back on HIPC Member Check-ins-

S. Heaven noted that D. Law had the list of assigned members and reports back emailed to her. She asked if D. Law would be comfortable sharing the feedback she received from Nominations members. D. Law said she would read the reports from the members that she received.

D. Law noted that S. Romero contacted a member that had not responded via email or phone. D. Law said this person's membership would expire this fall. If this person did not respond, they would likely roll off and there was no action needed.

For the person S. Nieves contacted, D. Law noted that this person's organization may or may not be active anymore.

For M. Cappuccilli's contact, D. Law said that the one contact did not respond, and the other contact had moved out of the area. She explained that both members' terms were also up in the fall, so there would be no action needed.

D. Law mentioned that all members with expiring terms were emailed notice and prompted to reapply to the council.

S. Heaven reported that her contact emailed her back and apologized for not attending meetings. This person was still interested in being a part of the HIPC. She would email them again today to inform them about upcoming meetings. D. Law asked if this person had switched organizations. S. Heaven said this was true and they now seemed to have a heavier workload, so she was unsure how this would impact their attendance moving forward.

L. Diaz said that her contact had taken maternity leave and would return in July. L. Diaz was unsure if this person was at the July HIPC meeting, but they seemed to be busy with work. If this person was not at the meeting today, L. Diaz would contact them. D. Law said this person's term was up as well this fall. L. Diaz said if they did not respond, they would likely fall off the council.

As for L. Diaz's other contact, she reported that this person seemed to have a recurring conflict during HIPC meeting times. D. Law said this person's term was also coming up. L. Diaz said if they were not able to prioritize the meetings, it may be best to let them roll off. D. Law said they could talk further about this when they reviewed applications and demographic information. Sometimes the Nominations Committee was more lenient with those having personal or work conflicts, especially when individuals were active in meetings and a community member. D. Law mentioned that this person had attended meetings in the recent past.

L. Diaz noted that it looked like they did not have to vote anyone off thus far.

J. Baez reported that his contact was still interested but was experiencing conflicts within their personal life. This person was still interested and would prefer calls as meeting reminders—additionally, they tried to attend allocations meetings but could not find a working link. If they did not attend today's HIPC meeting, J. Baez would contact them.

D. Law said that they currently had 18 members whose terms were expiring this fall. That was about half of HIPC's entire membership. She had so far received two new applications since the last Open Nominations round. One of the applications was incomplete and the other application was in the youth demographic.

As for expiring memberships, they were mostly veterans. D. Law read the list of members whose terms were about to expire. One of the individuals would likely roll off because they either moved or were no longer working at their organization.

D. Law said they currently had 41 members – if all 18 members rolled off, they would be under quorum. They had about 10 individuals that would possibly roll off with attendance issues. This was worrisome. L. Diaz suggested they need to find new members who might be interested. They would also need to keep in touch with individuals with attendance issues that were still interested in HIPC.

L. Diaz asked if they could contact the one member on a leave of absence. S. Moletteri felt it was okay to contact this individual. L. Diaz said she would consider contacting them.

If they had many individuals rolling off, D. Law suggested they do some personal recruitment. S. Heaven added that Nominations Committee could announce at the HIPC meeting that many members had upcoming expiring terms. S. Moletteri said there were 17 registrants for today's HIPC meeting and that some people later emailed her that they could not make the meeting.

S. Heaven said she would still make the announcement no matter the size of the group. Since the meeting would be small, she would suggest those in attendance reach out to other members not at the meeting.

Any Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

S. Heaven called for a motion to adjourn. <u>Motion: L. Diaz motioned, J. Baez seconded to</u> adjourn the August 2022 Nominations meeting. Motion passed: Meeting adjourned at 12:44 <u>p.m.</u>

Respectfully submitted,

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- August 2022 Nominations Meeting Agenda
- June 2022 Nominations Meeting Minutes

Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council

Description of Open Nominations Process Revised 8 May 2003 (updated April 2018)

The following steps shall be utilized to solicit, review, recommend, and appoint new members to the Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council. It is expected that this process will be utilized at least annually.

Step One. Solicitation of Members

The Office of HIV Planning advertises the availability of seats on the Planning Council through local media outlets and through distribution of applications at places where interested parties, particularly consumers, are likely to have access to them. The application shall include open-ended questions, an HIV disclosure form (for those applying for relevant seats), and conflict of interest information (including the Council's policy and disclosure form).

Step Two. Application Review

The Planning Council's Nominations Committee solicits members for and appoints an application review panel from among members of the Planning Council in good standing. The panel shall be comprised of no fewer than six members and shall reflect the demographics of the epidemic locally. At least 50% of the panel members must be HIV-positive. The review panel shall recommend applicants for membership twice during the planning cycle, once in the spring and once in the fall period. Utilizing objective criteria, each panel member completes an independent review of each blinded application reflecting whether or not an applicant should be appointed to the Planning Council. The review panel members evaluate each of the applicant's responses on the application separately, utilizing the following criteria:

Understanding of the Planning Council Skills/Experiences of the Applicant Relative to HIV Care Representational Needs of the Planning Council Applicant's Clarity regarding their contribution to the Planning Council

Each panel member then scores each of the applicant's responses based upon the following range:

4=Clearly fulfills this criteria.3=May fulfill this criteria.2=May not fulfill this criteria.1=Clearly does not fulfill this criteria.

The panel shall also consider the list of categorical seats that are to be filled, paying attention to demographics of the epidemic locally. The panel may consider additional documentation including, but not limited to, meeting attendance records for applicants seeking appointment for an additional term. Each panel member submits his or her ratings to the Office of HIV Planning staff. The staff tabulates results and develops a score sheet showing each reviewer's ratings for each applicant along with a cumulative rating for each applicant. The staff convenes a meeting of the review panel to discuss the applications and ratings. In assembling its recommendations for membership, the panel shall also consider the list of <u>categorical seats</u> that are to be filled, paying attention to <u>demographics</u> of the epidemic locally, as well as the applicants' <u>cumulative rating</u>.

The list of candidates, along with the group's overall rating for each, is then sent to the CEO (Chief Executive Officer for the Part A grant award) or the CEO's designee for consideration. The review panel may make additional recommendations to the CEO (such as a recommendation for representation by geographic area, recommending candidates for specific seats, etc.). This application review step may require more than one meeting of the review panel. If a member of the panel is applying for membership, s/he shall not review his/her own application nor be present during discussion of his/her candidacy.

Step Three. Review and Appointment by CEO or CEO's Designee

The CEO or designee reviews the panel's recommendations and, after full consideration, makes all appointment decisions. Each applicant is notified as to whether or not s/he is appointed and for what term length. Candidates not selected for appointment remain in the applicant pool for future consideration.

Step Four. Filling Vacancies

The CEO or designee fills vacancies from among candidates whose applications have been reviewed by the Council's review panel. If a vacancy arises for which there are few qualified applicants, the review panel may solicit additional applications for review and recommendation to the CEO or designee, utilizing the process described above. Applications may be submitted throughout the year; the application review panel may be convened as needed to review these applications so that candidates may be considered when filling vacancies.

Guidance and Considerations for Membership & Recommendation

• Membership on the Planning Council shall not exceed more than two members of the same affiliation. The review panel shall consider applicants' affiliation(s) as an additional guidance of the nomination

process, if there are more than one applicant and/or member of the same affiliation. (Spring 2007)

- Determination of applicants' area of representation: determination is based on whether the applicant represents their place of employment/the work that they do/their area of interest or as an individual. (April 2008)
- Sub-committee attendance policy (Article VI, Section 5): individuals who are in violation of the attendance policy <u>will</u> be removed from Planning Council. The Nominations Committee shall oversee and track the sub-committee attendance record noting members' attendance status and forwarding the notation to the respective sub-committee for further action. Co-chairs of the respective sub-committee will determine the individual's participation/contribution level and take appropriate action(s), with the removal of member carried out by the Nominations Committee. (May 2008)
- The committee shall recommend applicants for membership to the CEO or designee for official appointment of membership, understanding that the CEO or designee may or may not appoint all recommended applicants. During this process, recommended applicants shall attend an orientation and at least one scheduled RWPC meeting prior to their official appointment process. (February 2009)
- The committee may have a separate membership waiting list for unaligned consumers and others (i.e. providers). The waiting list would place qualified applicant(s) on "hold" until vacancy is available on the Planning Council. Applicants on hold will need to have attended meetings prior. (April 2009)
- Any resignation from members shall be reported to the Nominations Committee for formal documentation. (March 2010)
- Based on the attendance policy, members in violation will be removed. However, they will be given an opportunity to schedule an appeal in front of the Nominations Committee. The committee will require members who qualify for the appeal to commit and attend the next consecutive 5 council and sub-committee meetings in order to re-instate their membership (if the appeal is approved). (December 2017)