

VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, December 8, 2022
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: Lupe Diaz, Shane Nieves, Sharee Heaven, Mike Cappuccilli, Julie Hazzard

Excused: Juan Baez

Staff: Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh

Call to Order: Mike called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

Introductions: Mike noted that there was a new OHP staff member. Everyone introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

Mike referred to the December 2022 Nominations agenda and asked for a motion to approve.

Motion: Sharee motioned and Shane seconded to approve the December 2022 Nominations agenda. **Motion passed:** all in favor. The December 2022 agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (August 11, 2022):

Mike referred to the August 2022 Nominations minutes. **Motion:** Shane motioned, Sharee seconded to approve the August 2022 meeting minutes via a Zoom poll. **Motion passed:** 2 in favor, 1 abstaining. The August 2022 minutes were approved.

Report of Co-Chairs:

Mike said he'd spoken with a former member who had reapplied for membership. Whenever they review applications again, they should be able to see that.

Report of Staff:

Debbie said all applications for HIPC were approved even though they did not have tax clearances. OHP offered an explanation for what happened and the mayor approved them. Mike asked if the tax clearance was not an issue now. Debbie was unsure. Sharee said if it was not an issue this time, it may not be the next. Mike felt this was great that all the 15 applicants were approved.

Sofia said that there were two new applicants since the last open nominations process, but these were two new names to her. Mike asked when they would next review. Debbie answered in the

spring. Mike asked if the new applicants new this and Debbie said that this was written on the application.

Mike asked how many members were now on the council. Debbie said it was 36, but they were still under the 33% of unaligned consumers.

Discussion Items:

—Review Membership Bylaws/Open Nominations Process—

Debbie said this was brought up by Juan at one of the unofficial meetings for Open Nominations. This came up because they had an issue with requirements. This was included in the meeting packet.

Mike read the Article III: Membership, Section 1 portion of the bylaws. Please refer to the meeting packet page 2 of the bylaws portion. Mike asked if they tweaked this wording within the last year. Mike asked if they had tweaked this language recently. Sofia explained that they had tweaked the language under Article III: Membership, Section 4, not section 1.

Debbie was unsure what they wanted to do with the language. Sharee said they should consider lowering the membership number so they were not at threat for being not in compliance with their bylaws. Lupe asked why the numbers were 25-55. Debbie was unsure about the origin of these numbers, as this was before her time. Mike suggested they ask Mari. Debbie said that these were in the bylaws as set by the HIPC, so it was likely not federally mandated. Lupe and Mike suggested that they still see about the origin.

Mike's opinion at the moment was that they not tweak the language at the moment. He did not see the reason to lower at the current moment since they were usually okay with membership. Shane suggested adding a disclaimer that said they could dip below this number for only two nominations cycles max. Debbie said if they were to change the bylaws, this would be up for discussion within the Executive Committee and larger Planning Council.

Mike said they could look at this but could not make decisions. Debbie agreed, but they could recommend a change to the Executive Committee and offer a comprehensive explanation. Mike asked if they had had under 35 members in the past. Debbie said no. Lupe said they only struggled this time around which was likely pandemic related. Debbie responded that she had no strong opinions on this—she just brought it up because Juan had suggested it.

Lupe suggested they table this until Juan was in the meeting so he could explain his opinion on the bylaws. Mike agreed.

Debbie said they could review other parts of the bylaws as well and look at the Open Nominations process. The Open Nominations process was just for Nominations.

Lupe said in the past, if they did not have 6 people on the Open Nominations panel, they would call in the co-chairs, but the HIPC co-chairs were currently part of the Nominations Committee.

Mike said the current guidance for Open Nominations was never the reality of how they reviewed applications, so they could consider tweaking this. Debbie said they could bring this forward to the Planning Council for review if they decided to tweak it. It would likely have to be approved by the whole council depending on how much they changed the guidance.

Mike clarified that they would wait for Juan to discuss the bylaws. However, today they could look at the guidance for Open Nominations as a committee today. Debbie said they would not bring forward the guidance today.

Mike suggested they change “shall” to “we strive to.” Julie agreed, saying this could be considered aspirational language and would allow for wiggle room. Mike said that they could also change this language for the 50%. Lupe asked if the 50% of PLWH represented aligned consumers as well. Debbie said yes. Mike mentioned that the 50% of PLWH goal was not unique to the Nominations Committee.

Debbie suggested they go through the entire process for the Open Nominations process, since Juan brought this up. ***

Sofia suggested**

Mike asked if there were any barriers to filling the application online. Sharee said, not the application itself, but the tax clearance was difficult. Mike said that this might be out of their purview though. Sofia said that with the new tax clearance process, those from suburban counties and those renting could not get cleared.

Julie asked why the tax clearance was necessary. Debbie said this happened in 2017 from a Site Visit and was required by the mayor ** since HIPC was technically a City committee. Sharee asked if people who were appointed to councils, commissions, etc., should have to be approved for tax clearances. Sharee said this was voted on by the city, and HIPC fell into this because of their appointed status. Mike said they argued this previously, especially since certain individuals such as homeless individuals should be able to be represented on the council without a tax clearance. However, the city did not budge.

**

Mike said this was not a barrier they could correct at the moment. Julie said even though they could not correct this, they should at least mention it as a barrier. Sharee said they mention this often and the Project Officer (PO) was aware of this. She mentioned that K. Brady was the one to contact the mayor’s office about this. Julie said it should be documented within the minutes. Lupe and Debbie noted that this was well documented within the minutes during every application review process.

Sharee said they had some issues with reviewing based on what people chose to omit in their applications – however, there did not seem to be issues with the application itself. Sharee asked what they should review. Debbie said it might be beneficial to review the application process itself and see if anything needed to be added or changed, e.g. how applications were reviewed

and such. Mike asked if they should print it out, make notes, and review it next meeting or if they should review it together now. Debbie said this decision was up to them. Mike suggested that they make notes on the document with the Nominations Process and bring their notes to the next meeting.

Sofia said **.

Mike said that their barrier to recruitment and retention was virtual meetings. It was convenient for some people. Sofia said **. Mike said **. Lupe said that virtual was even a hurdle for the current members, because there was a disconnect that happened when being virtual. You could not connect with people in the same way virtually and stay after meetings. However, they had to be wary about COVID and those immunocompromised so it was a difficult situation. Julie agreed, saying that as a newer member, it seemed like the other Nominations members knew each other better and virtually, she had a little more difficulty getting familiar with individuals.

Mike said in-person was also better for newer members who could sit next to experienced members in order to ease the learning curve. Lupe said in-person allowed for bonding between members and you could not step away from the meeting in the same way that you can virtually. Mike said people did not have to travel and that could make attending meetings earlier, but people could lose interest more...

*** Mike said he never understood this logic in that sense since no one had to disclose their HIV status. Debbie said ***. Mike said that at Action Wellness ***.

Lupe said that it should be optional whether people wanted to show their faces or not on HIPC.

Lupe said ***. Mike said he would write that down and make a note. ***

Debbie said that they had about 5 or 6 new applicants and the rest were reapplicants. She asked everyone to consider this area. Mike asked about those who rolled off the council. Debbie said a lot of the people had switched jobs or moved. Mike recalled how Nominations Committee often connected with people who missed meetings and reached out to them. Shane asked if they had done this just in the summer. Mike responded that they did this often as part of their Nominations Committee process. They tried to communicate with members as best as they could. Mike added that they were also in need of more Nominations Committee members, but they often had the same group of people attending the meeting.

Sharee felt they had the same issues and discussions even pre-COVID. Mike agreed but questioned whether it was worse now. Lupe felt the concerns were the same. Sharee felt that sometimes community members did not come to meetings unless that had specific complaints. Unless people were attending as part of their job, people might not be incentivized to attend meetings. For example, if people moved jobs and did not need to attend or a person's housing issue was resolved, they may not feel the need to attend anymore. She understood that virtual meetings were a barrier to new members, but she just wanted to note the continuing patterns.

Debbie asked if they should direct their focus to the bylaws and the barriers to their Open Nominations process (not necessarily retention) for their next meeting. Everyone agreed.

—Increasing Engagement for Orientation—

Debbie explained that during the last orientation, she felt, was that individuals were not engaged and maybe this was because it was via Zoom. Mike asked if everyone was showing up. Debbie said less than when they were in person, but even then, she was unsure if people were listening.

Mike said it was helpful in person, because people from other committees could attend the orientation in person. Debbie said in the virtual interim, she wanted to brainstorm how they could make orientation more effective and engaging. As of now, Debbie asked them to fill out the questionnaire and watch some of the training videos. Mike asked if these were on their own time. Debbie said yes, these were on their own time. During last orientation, she just took clips of the videos and presented them.

Mike asked if it would be helpful to have more Nominations members engaged in the orientation like they had been in-person. Lupe suggested making it more interesting.

Shane said that sometimes things had to be reiterated for information to stick for new members. Having more facilitators might help as well as breakout rooms. However, they were unsure if the groups were big enough for breakout rooms to occur. Debbie said about 3-4 individuals would attend. Mike asked if orientation was a requirement. Debbie said it was. Mike asked what they did if people did not show up. Debbie said nothing, because it was required but there was no penalty.

Sharee said in the breakout rooms or after presentations, they might be able to quiz they afterwards and have someone guide the discussions. They could rotate the person from Nominations Committee facilitating and doing a Q&A. It might also help current Nominations members retain information about the council. They could also watch the video with the members during orientation and go through the details. This could engage people and create a more interactive environment. If this didn't work, then they could think of another way later.

They could try this method both virtually and maybe in-person. They could make the quiz into a game. ***

Julie said if they made the meeting somewhat fun, they might be more excited about coming back to the other meetings. Sharee agreed, saying that people were busy, so they had to make the best of what was happening right now and make the meeting more captivating in a sense. Sharee said orientation was only once a year so this was okay. Debbie said now that they were virtual, she combined fall and spring orientation.

Mike said they could do orientation before HIPC, try to have a short HIPC meeting, and then ask people if they had any questions after the HIPC meeting. Debbie said they tried not to have back-

to-back meetings since orientation was so long. Mike suggested, since it was once a year, they could talk to Mari and try to have a short meeting for this.

Sofia said **. Shane asked how long orientation was. Debbie said it was usually 2-3 hours. 12-2 p.m. would not give people a good break. Mike said they should look into the February HIPC meeting and plan for a relatively short meeting. This was just an idea.

Debbie asked if Nominations was definitely willing to participate in orientation. Mike said he was. Debbie said the meeting for HIPC was February 9th. Sharee said she was out of town during this. Lupe said she did not have anything on the schedule that day. Julie said if it was helpful to Debbie to assist with the actual presentation, she would help. Mike and Lupe seconded the sentiment.

Debbie said if this were the case, they could come up with ideas for the breakout room later and such.

Any Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

Mike called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion: Lupe motioned, Sharee seconded to adjourn the December 2022 Nominations meeting. Motion passed: Meeting adjourned at 1:44 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- December 2022 Nominations Meeting Agenda
- August 2022 Nominations Meeting Minutes
- Description of Open Nominations Process
- HIPC Bylaws