

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Thursday, January 12, 2023

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order

- ◆ Welcome/Introductions

- ◆ Approval of Agenda

- ◆ Approval of Minutes (*December 8, 2022*)

- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs

- ◆ Report of Staff

- ◆ Discussion Item
 - Increasing Engagement for Orientation
 - Review Membership Bylaws/Open Nominations Process

- ◆ 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: February 9, 2023 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

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: Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Lupe Diaz, Julie Hazzard, Sharee Heaven, Shane Nieves

Excused: Juan Baez (Co-Chair)

Staff: Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh

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

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

Approval of Agenda:

M. Cappuccilli referred to the December 2022 Nominations agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion: S. Heaven motioned and S. Nieves 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):

M. Cappuccilli referred to the August 2022 Nominations minutes. **Motion: S. Nieves motioned, S. Heaven 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:

M. Cappuccilli reported that he'd spoken with a former member who had reapplied for membership. Whenever they review applications again, they would see their application.

Report of Staff:

D. Law reported that all applications for HIPC were approved even if they did not have tax clearances. OHP offered an explanation around the difficulties with the tax clearance process, and the mayor approved all applications. M. Cappuccilli asked if the tax clearance would no longer be an issue. D. Law was unsure. S. Heaven said if it was not an issue this time, it may not be next time either. M. Cappuccilli was excited to hear that all the 15 applicants were approved.

S. Moletteri reported that there were two new applicants since the last Open Nominations process, but she had not heard of these applicants before. M. Cappuccilli asked when they would next review applications. D. Law responded that spring would be their next round for Open Nominations. M. Cappuccilli asked if the new applicants knew this, and D. Law said that this was written on the application.

M. Cappuccilli asked how many members were now on the council. D. Law said it was 38, but they were still under the 33% of unaligned consumers.

Discussion Items:

—Review Membership Bylaws/Open Nominations Process—

D. Law said this was brought up by J. Baez at one of the unofficial meetings for Open Nominations. Review of bylaws was mentioned due to the issues with HIPC requirements and membership numbers. The bylaws were included in the meeting packet.

M. Cappuccilli read the Article III: Membership, Section 1 portion of the bylaws. Please refer to the meeting packet for more information. M. Cappuccilli asked if HIPC had tweaked this wording within the last year. S. Moletteri explained that they had tweaked the language under Article III: Membership, Section 4, not Section 1.

D. Law was unsure what they wanted to do with the language. S. Heaven said they should consider lowering the membership numbers, so they were not at risk of noncompliance with their bylaws. L. Diaz asked why membership was mandated to be between 35-55. D. Law was unsure about the origin of these numbers since these numbers were established before she worked with OHP. M. Cappuccilli suggested they ask M. Ross-Russell. D. Law said these were in the bylaws as set by the HIPC, so it was likely not federally mandated. L. Diaz and M. Cappuccilli suggested that they still see about the origin.

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

M. Cappuccilli said they could discuss it but not make decisions just yet. D. Law agreed, adding that if they decided to alter the requirements, they would need to present the change to the Executive Committee as a recommendation accompanied by a comprehensive explanation. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had had under 35 members in the past. D. Law said no. L. Diaz said they only struggled this time around which was likely pandemic related. D. Law responded that she had no strong opinions on this—she just brought it up because J. Baez had suggested it.

L. Diaz suggested they table this until J. Baez was in the meeting, so he could explain his opinion on the bylaws. M. Cappuccilli agreed.

D. Law 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.

L. Diaz 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. M. Cappuccilli said the current guidance for Open Nominations was never the reality of how they reviewed applications, so they could consider tweaking it. D. Law said the guidance for the Open Nominations process would likely have to be approved by the whole council as well depending on the degree of the change.

M. Cappuccilli clarified that they would wait for J. Baez to discuss the bylaws. However, today they could look at the guidance for Open Nominations. He suggested they change “shall” to “we strive to” within the Open Nominations guidance. J. Hazzard agreed, saying this could be considered aspirational language and would allow for flexibility within the panel. M. Cappuccilli said that they could also change the language requiring 50% PLWH on the panel. L. Diaz asked if the 50% of PLWH represented aligned consumers as well. D. Law said yes. M. Cappuccilli mentioned that the 50% of PLWH goal was not unique to the Nominations Committee.

D. Law suggested they go through the entire process for the Open Nominations process, since J. Baez brought this up. S. Moletteri suggested they come up with a few ideas now to bring to the next Nominations Committee meeting. For example, they could currently discuss any barriers to the application process.

M. Cappuccilli asked if there were any barriers to completion of the online application. S. Heaven felt there were no issues with the application itself. The only barrier was the tax clearance process. M. Cappuccilli said this barrier was out of their control. S. Moletteri explained that with the new tax clearance process, those from suburban counties and those renting could not receive a tax clearance.

J. Hazzard asked why the tax clearance was necessary. D. Law said it was mandated in 2017 from a Site Visit and was required by the mayor since HIPC was technically a City Committee. S. Heaven said this was put to a vote within the City of Philadelphia, and HIPC fell under this decision. M. Cappuccilli said HIPC argued this previously, especially since certain individuals—such as those without housing—should be able to be represented on the council without a tax clearance. However, the city did not change their decision, so this was not a barrier they could correct. J. Hazzard said even though they could not correct this, they should at least mention it as a barrier. S. Heaven said they mentioned this often, and the Project Officer (PO) was aware of it. She further explained that K. Brady was the one to contact the mayor’s office about it. J. Hazzard said it should be documented within the minutes. L. Diaz and D. Law noted that this was well documented within the minutes during most application reviewal process.

S. Heaven said the Open Nominations panel had some issues with reviewing applications based on what people chose to omit within their applications – however, there did not seem to be issues with the application itself. S. Heaven asked what they should review. D. Law said it might be beneficial to review the application process itself and see if anything needed to be added or changed. She suggested they specifically focus on how the applications were reviewed. M.

Cappuccilli asked if they should print the guidelines, make notes, and review it next meeting or if they should review it together now. D. Law said it was up to them. M. Cappuccilli suggested that they make notes on the document with the Nominations Process and bring their notes to the next meeting.

M. Cappuccilli noted that a major barrier to recruitment and retention was virtual meetings. It was convenient for some people, but others could simply not attend. S. Moletteri said OHP was currently investigating hybrid as an option. L. Diaz said that virtual meetings were even a hurdle for the current members, because you could often feel disconnected from your peers. It also did not allow people to stay after meetings to talk and get to know each other. However, they had to be wary about COVID and those who were immunocompromised, so it was a difficult situation. J. Hazzard agreed, saying that as a newer member, it seemed like the other Nominations members knew each other better. Virtually, she had a bit more difficulty getting familiar with individuals.

M. Cappuccilli said in-person was also better for newer members who could sit next to experienced members in order to ease the learning curve. L. Diaz agreed that in-person allowed for bonding between members. Additionally, attendees could not step away from in-person meetings in the same way they could virtually. M. Cappuccilli said people did not have to travel and that could make attending meetings easier, but it was also easier for people to lose interest in a virtual setting when they were not able to connect with other members in the same way.

L. Diaz asked for a reminder about why cameras should remain off during the virtual meetings. S. Moletteri responded that this was a confidentiality purpose. Since the meeting was an online platform, technically anyone could join in from around the world. Additionally, when meetings were in person, OHP would record only audio on a physical tape recorder that could be safely stored in the office. On Zoom, faces, audio, and chat are all recorded on a computer/the cloud which could technically be compromised. This might be unlikely, but this way of recording was less secure than the physical tape recorder.

M. Cappuccilli asked more about the issues around confidentiality. S. Moletteri said that members who were PLWH might not want their identity known. Not having people show their faces allowed for a safe space where people could remain more-so anonymous. Additionally, OHP was livestreaming meetings on Facebook at the beginning of the pandemic which caused for even more concern around confidentiality.

M. Cappuccilli said he never understood this logic. The HIPC meetings had always been public, and people were not required to disclose their HIV status. D. Law said online was more accessible than a physical room that people had to get to. People tuning in who did not have full understanding of the meetings might simply assume all attendees were PLWH.

M. Cappuccilli said he volunteered at Action Wellness as a buddy, and there was no issue with putting people on camera. It was no issue putting people on camera in this scenario. L. Diaz suggested it be optional whether people wanted to show their faces or not during the HIPC meetings. D. Law said optional could be fine but was unsure if this had to go through the Executive Committee as a recommendation. M. Cappuccilli asked if they could consider this a

barrier to retention when recommending this to the Executive Committee. S. Moletteri did not think the no-camera policy was ever officially written down, so changing this might not be a huge process.

However, as it stood, S. Moletteri mentioned that many people in the HIPC meetings decided to keep their cameras on already. M. Cappuccilli said even if this was true, other members did not see them. L. Diaz explained that people may have their cameras on, but their screen would not show if they were talking. S. Moletteri further explained that this depended on people's individual Zoom settings, adding that if there was screensharing involved, viewers might only see the shared screen and not the individuals on camera. L. Diaz agreed that not showing faces was a barrier, but she understood the unwritten rule. M. Cappuccilli said he would make note of this as a barrier to retention so they could later revisit it.

D. Law said last round they had about 5 or 6 new applicants and that the rest were reapplicants. M. Cappuccilli asked about those who rolled off the council. D. Law said most of the people who rolled off had switched jobs or moved. M. Cappuccilli recalled how Nominations Committee often connected with people who missed meetings and reached out to them. S. Nieves asked if this was only performed this past summer. M. Cappuccilli responded that they did this often as part of their Nominations Committee process. They tried to communicate with members as best as they could. M. Cappuccilli added that they were also in need of more Nominations Committee members, but they often had the same group of people attending the meeting.

S. Heaven felt they had the same issues and discussions even pre-COVID. M. Cappuccilli agreed but questioned whether it was worse now. L. Diaz felt the concerns were the same. S. Heaven felt that sometimes community members did not come to meetings unless they had specific concerns. 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 also a barrier to new members, but she just wanted to note the continuing patterns.

D. Law 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—

D. Law explained that during the last orientation for new members, she felt that attendees were not engaged. She considered the idea that lack of engagement existed because the orientation was via Zoom. M. Cappuccilli asked if everyone was showing up. D. Law said there was less turnout than in-person, but even then, she was unsure if people were listening.

M. Cappuccilli agreed that in-person orientation was more engaging, because people from other committees could attend the orientation as well. D. Law said that in the virtual interim, she wanted to brainstorm how they could make orientation more effective and engaging. The current orientation process consisted of new members filling out a questionnaire and watching some of the training videos. M. Cappuccilli asked if this happened on their own time. D. Law said yes,

this was done on their own time in preparation for the Zoom orientation. During last orientation, she just took clips of some of the videos and presented them.

M. Cappuccilli asked if it would be helpful to have more Nominations members engaged in orientation like they had been in-person. S. Nieves said that sometimes things had to be reiterated for information to stick. Having more facilitators might help. They could also consider using breakout rooms. However, they were unsure if the groups were big enough for breakout rooms to make sense. D. Law responded that about 3-4 individuals would likely attend. M. Cappuccilli asked if orientation was a requirement. D. Law said it was. M. Cappuccilli asked about the penalty for not showing up. D. Law said there was no penalty.

L. Diaz suggested making orientation more interesting. S. Heaven said within the breakout rooms or after presentations, they could quiz the group with guided discussions. They could rotate the person from the Nominations Committee facilitating and doing a Q&A. She added that it might also help current Nominations Committee members refresh/retain information about the council. They could also watch the video with the members during orientation and go through the details. This could engage participants and create a more interactive environment. S. Heaven also suggested making the orientation quiz into a game. If this didn't work, then they could brainstorm a different approach.

J. Hazzard said if they made the meeting somewhat fun, new members might be more excited about coming to HIPC meetings. S. Heaven agreed, saying that people were busy, so they had to make the best of current circumstance and create a more captivating orientation. D. Law said now that they were virtual, she combined fall and spring orientation.

M. Cappuccilli said they could hold orientation before HIPC (in place of the Nominations meeting) and try to have a short HIPC meeting. After the HIPC meeting, they could ask new members if they had any questions. D. Law said they tried not to have back-to-back meetings since orientation was so long. M. Cappuccilli suggested, since it was once a year, they could talk to M. Ross-Russell and try to schedule orientation on the day of a shorter HIPC meeting.

S. Moletteri noted that the January would likely be lengthy. S. Nieves asked about how long orientation was. D. Law said it was usually 2-3 hours and that 12-2 p.m. might not give participants a long enough break before the HIPC meeting. M. Cappuccilli said they should consider the February HIPC meeting for post-orientation and plan for a relatively short meeting.

D. Law wanted a definite answer from the Nominations Committee about their interest in participating in orientation. M. Cappuccilli expressed certain interest. D. Law said the February meeting for HIPC was on the 9th. S. Heaven said she was out of town during this. L. Diaz said she did not have anything on the schedule that day. J. Hazzard said she would assist if needed. M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz seconded the sentiment.

D. Law said if participation from Nominations was certain, they could come up with ideas for the breakout room as well as hammer out the details around making orientation more engaging later.

Any Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, S. Heaven 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