

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Thursday, August 12, 2021

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order

- ◆ Welcome/Introductions

- ◆ Approval of Agenda

- ◆ Approval of Minutes (*May 13, 2021*)

- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs

- ◆ Report of Staff

- ◆ Discussion Items
 - Membership Attendance
 - Report Back on Membership Conversations
 - Second August Meeting

- ◆ 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: September 9, 2021 from 12:00 – 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

**Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council
Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, May 13, 2021
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, Kate King, Sam Romero

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

Call to Order: M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m. He welcomed everyone and skipped introductions.

Approval of Agenda: M. Cappuccilli presented the May 2021 Nominations Committee agenda for approval. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the May 2021 agenda. **Motion passed:** all in favor.

Approval of Minutes (*March 11, 2020*): M. Cappuccilli presented the previous meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the March 2021 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** all in favor.

Report of Chair:

M. Cappuccilli reported that he and S. Romero represented the Nominations Committee during the Site Visit meeting with the Executive Committee. HRSA asked a number of questions related to Nominations' responsibilities.

Report of Staff:

M. Ross-Russell reported that OHP/HIPC did not get cited for every issue mentioned throughout all of the meetings. After the Executive Committee met on Monday, HRSA asked her to participate in a meeting on Wednesday to speak to the concerns the consultant had with HIPC's composition, membership, etc. The findings HRSA compiled at the completion of the Site Visit did not reflect these concerns. Still, HIPC would likely talk more about their composition. HRSA requested that the council focus on recruiting recently released and incarcerated populations. Ultimately, HRSA did not cite them for this. She added that there were providers within the council who could assist with more representation from recently released and incarcerated populations.

M. Cappuccilli said he would soon have a meeting with a provider that could be of assistance for representation of recently released and incarcerated populations--were there any questions he should ask them about their program? As of this moment, M. Ross-Russell said no. She explained that the Site Visit expectations were still in flux due to the overarching circumstances of COVID-19. Therefore, HIPC would do the best they could to fulfill membership categories. Additionally, she had explained to the HRSA consultant that there were some members from the Positive Committee with a

history of incarceration. Even so, she explained, members were not expected to disclose their expertise if it involved personal experience.

M. Cappuccilli mentioned that the HIPC bylaws implied that 20% of members participating in a vote must be PLWH. He asked if M. Ross-Russell had any insight into this. M. Ross-Russell answered that the bylaws stated that quorum meant 20% of voting members must be PLWH. When this language was initially voted on, some recognized that this could be an issue. Alternatively, it also demonstrated the importance of PLWH being involved within the process. OHP often knew who were PLWH on the council. Therefore, there was never a need for roll call to ensure the exact percentage of 20% or over. The language, she explained, was meant to underline the sentiment. M. Ross-Russell explained that they were not cited for this within the final analysis, nor did HRSA bring up the bylaws again. They only cited them on the process of Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism for Rapid Distribution of Funds and Review of the PC budget.

M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law how she felt about this year's orientation process. D. Law noted that, typically, orientation was much more interactive. However, this was a difficult process over Zoom. M. Cappuccilli added that they did not receive 100% participation. He asked if those not in attendance contacted the office afterwards. D. Law said that D. D'Alessandro contacted the office and asked for a buddy--M. Cappuccilli acknowledged this, saying he was currently in contact with her.

M. Ross-Russell said that A. Williams contacted her, suggesting a more detailed orientation. It was expected that new members would be left with questions. This was much easier in-person, since new members were free to ask more questions before and after meetings. Therefore, OHP might have to extend themselves and be more available during the process. M. Cappuccilli suggested that, with virtual meetings, they make more use of breakout rooms. New members could then interact closely with co-chairs or staff in the smaller breakout rooms. This could ultimately make them more comfortable. S. Romero noted that within the meetings, people could message each other privately if needed. M. Cappuccilli asked if participants were taking advantage of this feature. D. Law said she would sometimes receive private messages from participants.

M. Cappuccilli asked if OHP received any information on when the city would reopen. In a recent meeting, M. Ross-Russell said, there was mention of two dates: May 21st and then July 6th for city offices to open. She had no other details.

Discussion Items:

—Current Membership Review—

J. Henrikson screenshared the membership demographic chart which contained current numbers and goal numbers. D. Law noted that she had recently reviewed this information within the Ad-Hoc Recruitment Workgroup meeting. HIPC had 46 members as of May 2021. She reported that consumer numbers had declined. The left column with the blue strip contained the current numbers, and the yellow chart contained ideal membership numbers. The highlighted portion in blue represented the goal numbers according to the EMA's percentage of HIV/AIDS cases. D. Law also typed out a written summary for HIPC goals.

M. Cappuccilli said, based on the numbers, they currently had 26% unaligned PLWH as members. Ideally, they wanted 33% of unaligned PLWH as members. This meant they currently had 12 unaligned PLWH as members and were looking to increase this number to 19. D. Law reminded

them that the percentage would change as they accepted more members. If they added 3 members and they were all unaligned PLWH, they would reach 33%. D. Law acknowledged the difficulty in this with meetings not in-person. M. Cappuccilli agreed, noting that the Planning CHATT Retention and Recruitment Learning Collaborative (LC) as well as the Ad-hoc Recruitment Workgroup were essential for this very reason.

D. Law mentioned that age was not included in the chart, but M. Ross-Russell noted that the CDC was pushing for inclusion of younger populations. M. Cappuccilli asked if it was possible to present this slide during the Nominations Committee report for HIPC. J. Henrikson agreed to screenshare the charts during the meeting. D. Law mentioned that there were also members who represented categories but listed this as secondary experience.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the addition of more formerly incarcerated individuals was all that was mentioned within the Site Visit. D. Law said, looking at the chart that indicated members and their representation, there were members who represented those formerly incarcerated. However, they have this listed as their secondary area of representation and the PLWH category as their first.

—*Membership Attendance*—

D. Law reminded everyone that they had reviewed this last time and made follow-up phone calls. They were to look at if there were any improvements in attendance. D. Law noted that the first had gotten a new job and was not attending meetings.

Regarding the next individual listed with attendance issues, M. Cappuccilli said he talked to them. They were having difficulty arranging their schedule and keeping everything in order. M. Cappuccilli was informing this member of meetings in advance, but they were in the middle of a move. However, he felt that this member would not be able to participate directly at this point in time. D. Law said they could try to reassign this member to somebody. S. Moletteri said they would look into this.

D. Law said that the next person had not attended January-March 2021 but attended in April 2021. M. Cappuccilli asked if they thought it was ethical to remove members for missing meetings. D. Law noted that their previous conversations around this acknowledged how they should not remove members at the moment and should focus on supporting people as best as they could. M. Ross-Russell and N. Johns had looked into this previously. M. Ross-Russell explained that when they performed outreach to uncover barriers to attendance, members requested more reminders and did not mention the digital divide much.

D. Law asked that they follow up with the next member listed for attendance issues.

D. Law acknowledged that the next person listed needed more reminders.

The next member had missed 6 meetings. She suggested that they reassign this member and reach out to them.

D. Law noted that the next member had a lot occurring in their personal life. This member was keeping in touch with the office.

D. Law asked if anyone was assigned to the next member with attendance issues. M. Ross-Russell asked if this member had left their previous organization. M. Cappuccilli said that this person had

two different email addresses. He emailed both and left messages, but he received no response. D. Law noted that this member had connections to a young population. D. Law said that during their next round of applications, they could reach out to this person.

S. Romero asked if there would be notification via mail when offices opened again. D. Law said that they would continue with email.

S. Romero reminded everyone that the next individual with attendance issues was out of touch with the Council. D. Law said, similar to a member mentioned earlier, this person had issues with internet access.

M. Ross-Russell noted that the next member was dealing with health issues. D. Law agreed, noting that their absences were excused for the last four meetings.

D. Law said the next member was young and had switched jobs. M. Ross-Russell said that some fields allowed for people to attend meetings more easily while others did not. S. Heaven said she was assigned to this person, and they had gotten another job. They seemed enthusiastic, noting that the emails would help them remember the meetings. However, they still did not come.

D. Law listed two members to reach out to again. As for the next member listed, they needed reminders, either email or phone call reminders. As for the next member listed, they were having health issues but did not request a leave of absence.

D. Law said that this member had requested a leave of absence a bit ago, but it had been a while since then. She asked if they should be put on the list to contact. M. Cappuccilli said yes.

D. Law said she would put the next person with attendance issues on a list to contact as well.

D. Law asked about the next member. S. Romero said he contacted this individual and they requested text reminders. S. Romero said he would reach out to this person again.

S. Heaven said she was assigned the next individual. At the time, this person had a couple deaths in the family. They said that the email reminders would help. S. Heaven said she would reach out to this person again.

D. Law listed the four people they would contact again. M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law to make the decision on how to assign each person. D. Law said this meant one person for each member to contact. M. Cappuccilli said he would keep the person from the last time he contacted them.

M. Cappuccilli asked how much membership had dropped since they transitioned to virtual meetings. D. Law said that attendance from members who were PLWH had dropped significantly.

Any Other Business:

M. Cappuccilli asked if there was anything the Nominations Committee needed to put on their roster based on the Site Visit. M. Ross-Russell said no. The issues identified in the beginning of the Site Visit fell by the wayside. HIPC just had to work towards legislative mandates. What they were going through with attendance issues, she said, was happening nationally. M. Cappuccilli said that this was clear from the LC. Many PCs were facing difficulties with attendance due to the virtual shift. M.

Ross-Russell said in-person meetings would help when people were comfortable. The Ad-hoc initiatives would also help.

M. Ross-Russell reported that she had received new applicants on Survey Monkey.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment: M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, S. Romero seconded to adjourn the May 13, 2021 Nominations Committee meeting. Motion passed: All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed:

- May 2021 Nominations Meeting Agenda
- March 2021 Nominations Meeting Minutes
- Current Membership and Goals: Percentage Chart
- HIPC Membership Gaps (April 2021): Written Summary