VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, May 11, 2023
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th St., Suite 320, Philadelphia PA 19107

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

Staff: Beth Celeste, Tiffany Dominique, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh

Call to Order: M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

Introductions: M. Cappuccilli asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

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

Approval of Minutes (*April 13, 2023*):

M. Cappuccilli referred to the April 2023 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned; M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the April 2023 Meeting Agenda via a Zoom poll. **Motion passed:** 4 in favor. The April 2023 Minutes were approved.

Report of Co-chairs:

None.

Report of Staff:

S. Moletteri said she would be staffing this meeting since D. Law was out of the country for vacation.

She notified the committee that J. Hazzard resigned from the HIV Integrated Planning Council (HIPC). J. Hazzard said she resigned because she no longer works in the field.

S. Moletteri reported that they have not received new applications since their last meeting. D. Law said reached out to the two applicants who had completed their applications and only one applicant had reached back. Since then, there were no new applicant submissions. S. Moletteri said they would not be reviewing applications since they would only be sending one application to the mayor and they would rather send the applicants in batches.

M. Cappuccilli asked if D. Law reached out to M. Ross-Russell about the language change in the Open Nominations Policy. S. Moletteri said they would need to make a motion as a recommendation in the Nominations Committee and then it must be approved by HIPC.

Discussion Items:

-Buddy/Mentor Brainstorm-

S. Moletteri gave an overview of the previous meeting regarding the implementation of the Pennsylvania HIV Planning Group (HPG)'s mentor program. The HPG had placed their new and veteran members in groups called pods. The pods would then meet after the general meeting to debrief and answer any questions the new members had. The Nominations Committee had discussed various formats they could use to adapt the mentor programs but was ultimately concerned that adding additional meetings would cause fatigue. The Nominations Committee decided in the April meeting that they would table the discussion for the next meeting.

S. Moletteri pulled up the guidance questions from the PA HPG mentor program. The guidance 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?

She asked if the committee members had ideas they would like to share. M. Cappuccilli asked if the guidance questions were only used once during the HPG meetings. S. Moletteri confirmed that her pod had only convened once. L. Diaz said her pod experience was different because she had met her pod in-person as opposed to S. Moletteri's experience meeting virtually. L. Diaz said she had met with her group three times. M. Cappuccilli asked how long the pod meetings lasted on average. L. Diaz said her virtual pod meeting had lasted one hour while the two pod meetings she had in-person had lasted ten to fifteen minutes. M. Cappuccilli asked about the frequency of HPG meetings. L. Diaz said the meetings took place every two months.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they had decided on the interval between each post-meeting if they had resolved to move forward with the idea. L. Diaz said that they were considering quarterly

meetings. S. Moletteri recalled how J. Hazzard suggested post-meetings after the shorter HIPC meetings. M. Cappuccilli said that if they had followed J. Hazzard's idea, the meeting date would be determined by the previous meeting instead of being a regularly scheduled meeting. He asked if the post-meeting would be an agenda item. S. Moletteri replied that the topic was still up for discussion. M. Cappuccilli said he liked the idea of placing the post-meeting immediately after a formal meeting because it would mean people were more likely to stay for both meetings. M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee had preferred to announce the post-meeting at the end of a formal meeting or to add the post-meeting as part of the agenda. M. Cappuccilli believed people would be willing to stay longer if the post-meeting was on the agenda of a formal meeting because it provided continuity. He said there was also the challenge of creating a post-meeting without estranging new members by making them feel singled out. S. Moletteri asked if the post-meeting would be listed before adjournment if it was placed on the agenda and if it would be recorded on the minutes. M. Cappuccilli said he had agreed on the placement of the post-meeting on the agenda but was hesitant about recording the post-meeting. He asked if there were times when they could speak off the record. S. Moletteri said they do speak off the record but she was hesitant towards allowing an entire agenda item to be off the record and said she would need to speak with M. Ross-Russell.

S. Moletteri asked about potential meeting structure if the post-meeting was placed on the agenda and unrecorded. She wanted to know if the post-meeting would be about the content covered in the formal meeting or if it would be a more casual meeting where they learn more about each other. M. Cappuccilli preferred that it would be about the formal meeting. He figured that members would be fatigued from the meeting and would want a post-meeting to ask questions about the formal meeting. M. Cappuccilli asked L. Diaz for her opinion on the topic. L. Diaz replied that it seemed that they were returning to their previous method of introducing members to new information. M. Cappuccilli disagreed and believed that they never had a formalized portion at the end of meetings to allow new members to ask questions. L. Diaz was concerned that new members would be too intimidated to ask questions.

M. Cappuccilli asked how the PA HPG had kept its members engaged in its pods. He asked if the PA HPG had made their meetings mandatory and questioned whether HIPC should do the same. L. Diaz said their situation was different than the PA HPG's. She said they had their pod meetings during the lunch hour while the HIPC had regularly scheduled meetings. L. Diaz said she had understood that member fatigue was an issue. M. Cappuccilli asked how they could structure the post-meetings to avoid this issue while maintaining an intimate but engaging environment. L. Diaz asked S. Moletteri how many people were present at her virtual pod meeting. S. Moletteri said there were about six to eight people present at the meeting. L. Diaz compared it to the three people who were present in her virtual pod meeting. She concluded that member attendance would depend on the type of member.

L. Diaz said her group was structured in a way that the members had varying levels of experience. The PA HPG would place a six-year member with members of descending experience. She added that the transition to face-to-face meetings had created an atmosphere of homogeneity since most HPG members had been meeting virtually before coming into an in-person setting. She believed the mentorship program would be a perfect fit for the committee since they would be transitioning to a hybrid setup. M. Cappuccilli asked if there was a

difference in engagement in members between HPG members and the HIPC. L. Diaz said there was a significant difference. She said the HPG members were meeting in-person in a style similar to a convention meeting where they were together for eight hours in one location. L. Diaz said they should start the process of adopting the mentorship program before they transition into in-person meetings.

T. Dominique asked about their goals for the mentorship buddy program. M. Cappuccilli said he had wanted to smooth the learning curve for new members. He was concerned that the difficulty curve of learning concepts such as the allocations process would turn away new members, especially in a virtual setting. T. Dominique said she remembered they had offered "brown paper bag" meetings during lunch hours where new members could meet with more experienced people during days when there was not a committee meeting. She said they had these meetings before the pandemic when they had in-person and they could do something similar by having thirty-minute meetings on a day without a committee meeting. She was concerned that a post-meeting would be taxing for members like M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz who had back-to-back meetings with the Nominations Committee and HIPC meetings. M. Cappuccilli said the process of educating new members was easier in the past since veterans could simply sit next to the new member and whisper any missing context or answer any questions. T. Dominique asked if they could use the virtual chat to send a new member a private message. M. Cappuccilli said they had done something like that. M. Cappuccilli recalled a previous member who would send him texts when she had questions. He said they could consider returning back to the method of teaching new members. L. Diaz said she had a different experience with a new member. She said she had sent them several messages but the member did not reply. She said this method's effectiveness depends on the new member and the mentor. M. Cappuccilli agreed and said the method only works when they have an engaged new member.

M. Cappuccilli asked how a virtual "brown bag" meeting worked. T. Dominique said that in her previous virtual meeting experience, she and the other attendees would meet thirty minutes before the meeting to have a casual conversation. She again suggested that they would have an office hours meeting that would take place on a day without a committee meeting. M. Cappuccilli liked the idea and asked S. Moletteri if they could find a slot. S. Moletteri replied that they would not be able to choose a slot before the HIPC meeting since the Nominations Committee meeting regularly takes place before. She said they would want their members to remember the content of the meetings so they could ask questions. S. Moletteri suggested having the meetings on Fridays since it would allow the members to ask questions after they attended a meeting the day before. S. Moletteri said it was natural for people to forget details if they were attending several meetings.

S. Nieves raised their hand and voiced their concern that some members may be too embarrassed to ask questions since they may feel they should easily comprehend the content. They suggested that the committee create guidance questions similar to the questions from the HPG meetings to anticipate the questions members may have and to steer the discussion. S. Moletteri suggested that a staff person should create questions tailored to each committee meeting. S. Moletteri wondered if they could also accept anonymous questions that they could read during the post-meeting. M. Cappuccilli suggested that they would direct questions to S. Moletteri during the HIPC meetings. S. Moletteri agreed that this was a good idea and said that some people

already sent her questions privately during the meeting. S. Moletteri said they could also send people a link that would send them to a website so their questions could be read in the post-meeting on Friday. S. Nieves said they felt this idea was useful since they would often think of questions after the meeting while doing chores. M. Cappuccilli asked the staff member what their schedule was like on Fridays. He asked if one Friday per month was feasible. S. Moletteri said the idea was worth discussing and she would need to speak with the other staff members before it could be implemented.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they should record minutes for the office hours meeting. S. Moletteri said she felt the office hours meeting should be casual and not be recorded. S. Heaven said she felt the only time minutes should be recorded was if the meeting was process-oriented. She said the minutes should serve to help a HIPC or staff members understand the process or discover a new way that would improve the process. M. Cappuccilli asked if they could bring this idea forward to the next HIPC meeting for approval.

S. Moletteri said she knew people were tired on Fridays. She asked the committee if they would like the office hours meetings to be earlier in the day or later. L. Diaz said either was feasible for her. M. Cappuccilli believed that a meeting later in the day would not do well because people would be thinking of the weekend. S. Nieves said their job generally had trainings or meetings in the morning on Friday and asked for an early afternoon slot. The committee then decided that an early afternoon meeting around their usual meeting times would be an appropriate compromise. S. Heaven said she did not know what her schedule would look like and asked for a meeting time that would be closer to mid-morning. The committee then agreed they would hold office hours from around 12:30 pm to 1:30 pm. T. Dominique said the office hours do not have to last long. She said they could be 30 minutes long and they could leave early if no one comes to the office hours. S. Moletteri asked the committee what they would like to name the office hours meeting. T. Dominique suggested "Chat With the Council." The committee members agreed that it was an appropriate name.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the idea was ready to be brought forward to the HIPC. S. Moletteri said the idea was not ready yet, but they could introduce the idea in the HIPC Committee reports portion of the meeting.

S. Nieves asked when the Friday office hours meetings would begin. S. Moletteri answered that they do not know yet. M. Cappuccilli asked S. Moletteri to place the idea on the next agenda. M. Cappuccilli said this would give D. Law time to read the minutes and give her opinion on the matter.

-Open Nominations Policy Update-

S. Moletteri highlighted the language they had elected to change from the previous meeting. The language they were proposing to change had read:

> 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 Nominations Committee proposed to change the language to:

> The panel aims to have no fewer than six members and to reflect the demographics of the epidemic locally. PLWH are always encouraged to participate in the application review process.

S. Moletteri asked if the committee was still committed to going forward with the language change. The committee indicated that this was still their intention. S. Moletteri also suggested updating the Open Nominations Policy to remove the binary pronouns in favor of using "they/them" to be inclusive. The committee agreed that this was a positive change. S. Heaven asked if they would add "they" in addition to "he/she." L. Diaz said they would replace all mentions of "he/she" since "they" encompassed everyone. M. Cappuccilli asked if this language change would also include the HIPC Bylaws. S. Moletteri said the language change would only include the Open Nominations Policy. M. Cappuccilli asked why they could not update the language in other committee policies. T. Dominique replied it would be outside the Nominations Committee's jurisdiction. S. Moletteri agreed and added that they could discuss this in the Executive Committee.

Motion: M. Cappuccilli motioned; L. Diaz seconded to bring a proposal to the HIPC to make the above mentioned policy language changes in the Open Nominations Policy.

<div align="center">

L. Diaz: In Favor
M. Cappuccilli: In Favor
J. Baez: In Favor
S. Heaven: In Favor
S. Nieves: In Favor

</div>

Motion Passed: all in favor. The motion to bring a proposal to the HIV Integrated Planning regarding the changes in policy language in the Open Nominations Policy was approved.

Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

L. Diaz announced there would be an Aging Symposium on May 14th, 2023 at King of Prussia. She encouraged the committee members to attend.

Adjournment:

M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, and M. Cappuccilli seconded to adjourn the May 2023 Nominations Committee meeting. **Motion passed:** Meeting adjourned at 1:06 p.m

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:
- May 2023 Meeting Agenda
- April 2023 Minutes
- Open Nominations Process (PDF)