

# MEETING AGENDA

*VIRTUAL:*

*Thursday, May 11, 2023*

*12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.*

- ◆ Call to Order
  
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
  
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
  
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (April 13th, 2023)
  
- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs
  
- ◆ Report of Staff
  
- ◆ Discussion Item
  - Buddy/Mentor Brainstorm
  - Open Nominations Policy Update
  
- ◆ 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: June 8th, 2023 from 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](http://www.hivphilly.org)

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

**VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes of**  
**Thursday, April 13, 2023**  
**12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Juan Baez (Co-chair), Michael Cappuccilli (Co-chair), Lupe Diaz, Julie Hazzard, Shane Nieves, Sharee Heaven

**Staff:** Beth Celeste, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh,

**Call to Order:** M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

**Introductions:** M. Cappuccilli skipped introductions.

**Approval of Agenda:**

M. Cappuccilli referred to the April 2023 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** J. Hazzard motioned; M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the April Nominations agenda. **Motion passed:** 4 in favor. The April 2023 agenda was approved.

**Approval of Minutes (January 12, 2023):**

M. Cappuccilli referred to the January 2023 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned; S. Nieves seconded to approve the January 2023 Meeting Agenda via a Zoom poll. **Motion passed:** 4 in favor and 1 abstaining. The January 2023 Minutes were approved.

**Report of Co-chairs**

None.

**Report of Staff**

None.

**Discussion Items:**

***-Debrief of Orientation Presentation-***

M. Cappuccilli gave an overview of the Orientation presentation. He said D. Law had taken the lead in the presentation and had created the slideshow for the Orientation. They had decided to divide the presentation into five parts among M. Ross-Russell, M. Cappuccilli, D. Law, and L. Diaz. The reasoning behind the new format was to engage the audience with a different speaker

so the speakers would retain the audience's interest. The speakers each gave some information about their backgrounds and then described their topics before handing the presentation to the next person. M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law if the format had kept the audience's attention. D. Law replied that she felt the attendees were more interested in learning more about the Planning Council and asked more questions toward the end of the presentation. M. Cappuccilli said that the virtual nature of the meeting made it difficult to make the meeting engaging. Still, he believed that the format successfully held the audience's attention. S. Nieves and J. Hazard agreed. J. Hazzard said it felt like the audience had more of a stake in the meeting and were able to participate rather than listen passively.

M. Cappuccilli lamented that they were not able to review the quiz at the end of the meeting as they had hoped. He said the quiz would have been helpful, but the meeting was too long, and there needed to be more time for other activities. He said there were other ideas that he had wanted to enact, but the presentation's run time of two hours had made them impractical. D. Law said the meetings were previously three hours in person. She said the presentation was shorter, and the members were given materials before the meeting. She said she used to send members one video before the meeting. Now she has sent two to three videos per week over three weeks. D. Law said she hoped that the recurring engagement would allow the members to consider questions they would like to ask. M. Cappuccilli asked if there was evidence that the members had viewed the videos before the meeting. D. Law said that some people had watched the videos. She could not confirm that the members had watched the entire video.

Then M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law if the members had feedback about the format after the presentation. D. Law said she has yet to get any feedback. Then he asked if the members would want to continue with the orientation structure. D. Law said she could not give a definitive answer. She said the last time they had the orientation, the audience was not as engaged because they were all providers. She felt that a narrow audience demographic and the virtual nature of a Zoom meeting fostered an environment where the audience member did not have to consider other perspectives and knowledge bases other than their own.

The committee began a discussion about the possibility of in-person meetings. M. Cappuccilli asked if they could do in-person meetings if there were fewer people. D. Law said she did not have an answer. She said they had used to invite members in-person to introduce themselves. She said it was an option that they could consider. M. Cappuccilli believed that in-person meetings were the best option. D. Law said the members had mixed feelings about in-person meetings. She did not want to coerce members into an in-person meeting if they did not want to. She said she would offer an option for an in-person meeting the next time for the next Orientation and decide based on the responses that she receives. M. Cappuccilli said he was in favor of both types of meetings. D. Law said that she appreciated M. Cappuccilli's segment in the presentation because it had broken the monotony with quizzes to keep the members engaged. M. Cappuccilli said he had felt that M. Ross-Russell's presentation on Roles and Responsibilities during HIPC was a great addition to the information presented in the Orientation.

M. Cappuccilli asked the committee if they felt they had enough time to prepare for the Orientation meeting the day before the meeting. D. Law said M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz were veteran members of the Planning Council. She said they were both knowledgeable in their

subjects, and she believed they were very informative during the presentation. M. Cappuccilli said it was a good idea to decide the order of the presentation speakers the day before Orientation.

### ***-Bylaws Discussion-***

The Nominations Committee continued their discussion about the Bylaws that started in December 2022. M. Cappuccilli referred to the HIPC Bylaws and turned to Article III on membership. D. Law said that in the meeting in December 2022, M. Ross-Russell had spoken about the minimum membership number. One of the questions during the meeting was why the Planning Council required a minimum of 35 members. D. Law explained that they needed 17 members to represent underserved populations and the disproportionately affected by HIV. They doubled the minimum number of members to 34 people to ensure representation and then increased it to 35 to prevent ties in voting. M. Cappuccilli asked if the 35-member minimum and the 55-member limitation were guidance from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). M. Ross-Russell had said it was something the Planning Council decided. M. Cappuccilli mentioned that they had also discussed why their membership numbers had hovered towards the low end. M. Ross-Russell explained that it was due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the nature of virtual meetings. She assured them their membership numbers would recover once they transitioned to in-person meetings. M. Cappuccilli was concerned that if their membership stayed the same in the next few years, they would be in violation of their Bylaws. D. Law said another issue they had discussed was that a tax form was required for nominees to become members. D. Law said this was a barrier because people had not completed the form or were denied because their tax clearance was rejected. D. Law said they were currently bypassing the tax requirement.

M. Cappuccilli referred to Bylaws Article III Section 4. The Bylaws stated:  
It shall be the goal of the Planning Council that a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the voting members are people with HIV and that, among members with HIV, at least thirty-three percent (33%) have no consulting, employment, or fiduciary relationship with any provider agency that receives Part A funds.

He believed that any changes to the policy would first need to be reviewed by the Executive Committee and then approved by the Planning Council. D. Law said the language concerning the 33% had to stay since it was in the legislation, but the language regarding the 50% goal could change. M. Cappuccilli said they had been discussing the language related to 50% of the membership to be represented by people living with HIV (PLWH). He believed the committee had decided in a previous meeting that reaching 50% PLWH was more feasible as a goal than a requirement. He said the phrasing in the statement could be confusing. For example, he noted that the policy had required 33% of PLWH in the Planning Council to be unaligned with special interests rather than both PLWH and non-PLWH to be unaligned. J. Baez said that as long as the language was aspirational, they were not in violation of the Bylaws.

M. Cappuccilli asked the committee to focus on Article VII Section 2. The passage stated, "Each committee shall establish its own quorum, of which at least twenty percent (20%) shall be people living with HIV." M. Cappuccilli said they should make this section a goal rather than a

requirement. He said that they could not guarantee that the quorum would be PWLH. M. Cappuccilli said that the Nominations Committee often could not meet the requirement of 20% of the committee being PWLH. J. Baez suggested that they admit people who meet the criteria into the committee regardless of whether they were interested in joining. M. Cappuccilli said the statement did not refer to the type of people they admitted to the committee. He said it referred to the committee's composition overseeing the nomination process. J. Baez said they should make it easier for PWLH to apply to the Planning Council. M. Cappuccilli said that as a committee, the question was whether they were overseeing the nomination process per their Bylaws. He asked if they were reviewing nominations with five people, should at least one of five be HIV positive. D. Law explained that they usually decide the nominations by the panel. She said that in the past if they needed more people for the panel, they would ask for volunteers from other committees. D. Law said this panel was different from a committee. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had to be a member of the Nominations Committee to be on the panel. D. Law said you only need to participate regularly in the Planning Council. J. Baez said he believed they had invited members of the general public to vote on the nominations process.

J. Baez feared that the language in the Bylaws was becoming too strict and said that this could be delaying the nominations process. M. Cappuccilli said he was only trying to loosen the language so they would be under the Bylaws. D. Law suggested that they should not add the phrase "reflective of the demographic" and should add the word "goal" in the statement. M. Cappuccilli agreed with this suggestion. J. Baez asked why they had to add the phrase "the Planning Body would be reviewing nominations." D. Law said it was because the Bylaws dictated how every committee functioned, not just the Nominations Committee.

D. Law said that each committee had set its own quorum. M. Cappuccilli asked if other committees set their quorums besides the Nominations Committee. D. Law explained that the review panel was not a committee. M. Cappuccilli said he remembered they had voted on a quorum. She said that was only for the panel reviewing the nominations. D. Law said that when needed more review panelists in the past, they would invite other people from outside the Nominations Committee to help review the applications. M. Cappuccilli asked what was the difference between a quorum and a panel. D. Law said the panel was a different group. M. Cappuccilli asked about the function of a quorum within a panel. J. Baez said he believed that to start voting, they needed to have a quorum. He asked if M. Cappuccilli had meant to ask if they needed a quorum before conducting any business in the Nominations Committee.

M. Cappuccilli decided that that language regarding quorums for PLWH was too restrictive because they never verified if the committee members were PLWH before voting. J. Baez asked if they had a quorum in the Nominations Committee. D. Law said they generally did not vote on anything in the Nominations Committee that would require a quorum. M. Cappuccilli asked what part of the Planning Council and its subcommittees uses a quorum to vote. D. Law said that it was the Planning Council itself that used a quorum to vote. M. Cappuccilli asked if the HIPC had a method to verify that 20% of its members were PLWH. D. Law explained that the statement M. Cappuccilli had referenced only applied to committees and not the Planning Council. M. Cappuccilli then asked if any of the committees had verified if their quorums had 20% of their members represented by PWLH. S. Moletteri said they had reviewed the Bylaws in 2019 and changed the language to be more goal-oriented so they would not require members to disclose

their HIV status before voting. D. Law said that before the transition to virtual meetings, the staff and the co-chairs of each committee knew the HIV status of its members. She said that was how they knew if the committee was within the Bylaw.

S. Moletteri said that in the past, they reviewed the language regarding the panels in the Open Nominations document. She referenced the Bylaw statement, “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.” D. Law said this was goal-oriented language. She said that every time they had fewer than six members for the panel, they had to first vote on whether it was acceptable to have fewer than six members for the voting cycle. M. Cappuccilli asked if they could change this language. D. Law replied that the committee had created this document so they could explain what the nominations process was like. She said they would need to bring it forward to the Planning Council if they wanted to change the process or committee. She said a proposal to change the language would not need a thirty-day review since it was not part of the Bylaws.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee wanted to change the language regarding panels to be more flexible. D. Law asked how M. Cappuccilli would change the language. M. Cappuccilli said, “A panel shall be established for each application review with a goal being no fewer than six members and also being representative of the epidemic.” He said that the 50% requirement was something they could not achieve. D. Law said that they had attempted to change the language in the past, but there were PWLH who had opposed it. J. Baez suggested inviting the Positive Committee to review applications. D. Law said the issue with this suggestion was that not all the Positive Committee members were part of the Planning Council. She confirmed with S. Moletteri that only three members of the Positive Committee were Planning Council members.

M. Cappuccilli asked about the process for changing the language. He asked if they could vote on the language in the Nominations Committee. D. Law said they should give themselves time to reflect on the language change and then propose to the Planning Council to change it. M. Cappuccilli agreed with this process and suggested that they change the policy language to “The panel shall have as a goal no fewer than six members which reflect the epidemic locally and as a goal of the panel members will be HIV-positive.” J. Baez was concerned that the language asked members to disclose their HIV status. He asked if they should remove the language or revisit the idea to change it. M. Cappuccilli reminded J. Baez that they had received pushback when they had attempted to remove the language previously. J. Baez replied that they had received pushback in the past, but it does not mean they would receive pushback in the future. He said that if they had tried to make the language goal-oriented, they would still need to ask people to disclose their HIV status. J. Baez explained they would have to check each committee member's HIV status; otherwise, they approved words that lacked meaning. He said the Planning Council should strive to be inclusive. M. Cappuccilli suggested they should revise the language to say, “The Panel shall have as a goal no fewer than six members and the goal being to reflect the demographics of the epidemic locally.” He said they should not add anything to that statement. J. Baez suggested the language should read that the “goal of the panel should always be to encourage people living with HIV to have an active voice and elect people to the Planning Council.” M. Cappuccilli agreed with J. Baez’s last statement and said that consumers must

always be encouraged to participate in application reviews. J. Baez said that was the spirit of what they were trying to say, but they were trying to be gatekeepers of who could and could not vote.

M. Cappuccilli suggested they remove the last sentence in the statement requiring a 50% representation of PLWH and replace it with “consumers are always encouraged to participate in this process.” D. Law said they should replace the word “consumer.” She explained that not all people were consumers; some would find the word offensive. S. Moletteri suggested using the words “people living with HIV.” The committee agreed with the terminology and revised the statement.

With input from the committee, M. Cappuccilli read the new statement regarding the committee panels. The new language stated, “The panel aims to have no fewer than six members to reflect the demographics of the epidemic locally. PLWH are always encouraged to participate in the application review process.”

**Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned. J. Hazzard seconded changing the language in the nominations policy regarding the review panel to what was stated above.

M. Cappuccilli: approve

J. Baez: approve

J. Hazzard: approve

S. Nieves: approve

S. Heaven: approve

**Motion passed:** All in favor. The motion to change the language in the nominations process regarding the review panel was approved.

D. Law said they would revisit the proposal in the May Nominations Committee meeting. She said they would then decide to forward the proposal to the Planning Council. M. Cappuccilli asked if they needed to make a motion in the next meeting to bring the proposal to the Planning Council. D. Law said she would need to ask M. Ross-Russell for more information.

### ***-Buddy/Mentor Brainstorm-***

L. Diaz attended the PA HIV Planning Group (HPG) and suggested they consider adapting the buddy/mentor system that HPG was using. D. Law said that C. Steib and S. Moletteri were also in the HPG.

S. Moletteri said the PA HPG ‘s buddy/mentor system was a pod where more than one buddy/mentor had met. She believed that there were four to five pods that had met after the meeting to debrief. She said they paired the most experienced and least experienced members. S. Moletteri felt the mentor system was open and more personal. She shared the guiding questions that she had received in the HPG mentor pods. M. Cappuccilli suggested tabling the discussion until the next meeting when L. Diaz would be present.

S. Moletteri sent the guiding questions from the HPG to the committee. The questions were:

- What are your thoughts and questions after the first meeting?
- What is your biggest goal or hope for your time with the HPG?
- Why did you join the HPG?
- What seems most exciting about the HPG, and what's the most confusing?
- Do you have any questions about the HPG's in state planning?
- Some more personal questions:
- What do you consider your biggest strength?
- What is something in your past you are proud of?
- What is a job you've enjoyed?
- Where do you live or what's the favorite place you've lived? Tell us what's unique about it.
- What's a funny story from your past and/or a fun fact about you?
- Who (or what) has been your greatest teacher?
- What's a place or country you hope to visit in the future?

M. Cappuccilli asked S. Moletteri how large the pods were. S. Moletteri answered that there were about 5-10 people per pod. She was unsure how many pods there were in total. M. Cappuccilli asked how many people were in the general meeting. S. Moletteri said there were slightly less than thirty members in the meeting. M. Cappuccilli asked if everyone in the meeting had joined a pod. S. Moletteri replied that all HPG members were assigned a pod. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had a debrief after every meeting. S. Moletteri said that they had met after the first meeting and had not met since then. She said she did not know the pod meeting schedule. She believed that the HPG had planned to have the pods meet after each meeting, but that was not how it operated thus far. M. Cappuccilli asked how long the pod meetings were. S. Moletteri replied that they generally lasted one hour. She said the HPG staff member who handled the emails led the pod meetings. She said they had discussed the guidance questions in the meetings, but most people were having casual conversations. M. Cappuccilli asked how long the general meeting was. S. Moletteri said the general meeting format was eight-hour sessions with breaks over two days. She said the meetings were every other month.

M. Cappuccilli asked if there was a variation of the HPG meeting that had worked with the HIPC meeting format. S. Moletteri replied that HPG had met every other month while HIPC met twice monthly if one also considered the required committee meeting. She questioned if people were willing to devote more time to monthly meetings. M. Cappuccilli asked if the pod meetings were mandatory and whether members could opt out of the meetings. S. Moletteri said a few people did not attend the pod meetings. She believed that there was high attendance because the HPG meetings were infrequent.

M. Cappuccilli remarked that the HPG mentor system seemed similar to the systems that the Nominations Committee had been developing. The committee had contemplated having a brief voluntary post-meeting where members stayed behind. He said that the HPG mentor system seemed like a more formalized version of this idea. He said they were unable to implement the idea because the members were unwilling to stay for another long meeting. He added that the other issue was that the OHP staff members often had their meeting after each HIPC and



committee meeting. He was concerned that it would conflict with a post-meeting. S. Moletteri said M. Ross-Russell was thinking of allowing a post-meeting every other month. She said the staff members had their notes so they would not miss anything from the main meetings. M. Cappuccilli suggested that at least one staff member and co-chair would stay behind after the committee meetings to oversee the post-meeting.

L. Diaz entered the meeting and introduced herself. M. Cappuccilli questioned whether it was reasonable for members to attend post-meetings on a different day than the HIPC meeting. L. Diaz said the post-meetings did not have to be conducted directly after a HIPC meeting. She said that a post-meeting could be done at any time as long as a staff member was present to open the Zoom room.

L. Diaz recalled her experiences with her pod. She said three of her pod members had attended the HPG pod meeting. S. Moletteri said that about six members of her pod had attended the HPG post-meeting. L. Diaz had concluded that attendance for the post-meeting depended on the type of people assigned to a group. M. Cappuccilli said they had been discussing a quarterly meeting in the Nominations Committee. L. Diaz said they did not have to imitate every aspect of the HPG pod meetings. She said the HIPC post-meeting format should be what they were comfortable with.

M. Cappuccilli asked how they would decide the format of the post-meeting. He asked if they had to create a proposal and then send it to the Planning Council for approval. L. Diaz said that was most likely the case. She said they could also announce the proposal at an Executive Committee meeting. M. Cappuccilli if the committee was comfortable deciding at the moment or if they wanted to table for the next meeting. L. Diaz concluded, based on the committee's response, that they would want to table the issue until the next meeting. M. Cappuccilli asked the committee to imagine they were a new member of HIPC. He asked what format and frequency for the post-meeting would make the most sense to aid new members in learning about their roles and responsibilities as Planning Council members. S. Nieves expressed concern that a post-meeting would cause fatigue since they would be in front of a computer for three hours with little room for breaks from two meetings. M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz agreed with this sentiment. L. Diaz said she had often kept her meetings concise and on-topic because she knew that a two-hour and thirty-minute meeting could be tiresome. M. Cappuccilli said that if they were to enact the idea, they would need to hold the post-meeting after a short committee meeting. He said they could not have a post-meeting after a two-hour and thirty-minute meeting. J. Hazzard that they could predict when meetings would be longer or shorter based on the calendar. J. Hazzard suggested that a quarterly post-meeting would be feasible. L. Diaz said they could support this idea by ensuring the HIPC meeting agenda before the post-meeting was not as hefty as usual. M. Cappuccilli proposed adding the post-meeting as an agenda item for the HIPC meeting. He said they could ask the members to take a break at the end of the committee meeting before heading into the post-meeting. M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee could table the post-meeting discussion for the next meeting. The committee had agreed to table the discussion until the next meeting, where they would develop the format further. He asked the OHP staff to place the discussion on the next agenda.

### **Other Business:**

D. Law reminded the committee that half of the Planning Council members' terms would expire in the coming fall season. She said they had to start their open nominations process early. They also had to consider that it was the members' last term in the four consecutive 2-year terms that they were allowed. L. Diaz asked if this meant the members were of the Planning Council. D. Law said they would not be off the Planning Council but would be on their last term before a mandatory 1-year break.

D. Law said she had received applications and found they were primarily incomplete except for two applications. She said she had contacted the two applicants who had completed the form. She had only received one response. M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law to give them a time frame. D. Law said they were supposed to review these applications as part of their spring open nominations process. She asked the committee if they had wanted to review the applications in May if they received more responses. M. Cappuccilli said this was acceptable as long as they had sent an email to guarantee they had enough members for a review panel. D. Law was concerned that they would only receive one application. She said she would not want to send only one application to the mayor.

M. Cappuccilli asked when HIPC would admit the new applicant. M. Cappuccilli asked if there could be an orientation shortly after admitting the new member. D. Law said she had usually saved the orientation for when they had a larger cohort. She said the recent orientation was for the new spring and fall application cycle members. M. Cappuccilli asked if they should postpone the orientation until the fall season. D. Law said she could not make a decision and could only report the situation to the committee so they could make an informed choice. She said she had already contacted the individuals and had hoped they would attend the meetings. M. Cappuccilli asked if they were still reviewing applications in the spring and fall as expected. D. Law said they were, but everything had been delayed due to the delayed orientation and lack of applications. M. Cappuccilli asked if the following open nominations process would be considered part of the spring season. D. Law confirmed that this was correct. M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz said that they were content with this situation.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they could review the applications during their regular committee meeting if there were few applications. D. Law believed that they could.

### **Announcements:**

None.

### **Adjournment:**

M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion: L. Diaz motioned, and M. Cappuccilli seconded to adjourn the April 2023 Nominations Committee meeting. Motion passed: Meeting adjourned at 1:42 p.m**

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- April 2023 Meeting Agenda
- January 2023 Minutes
- HIPC Bylaws