

VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee

Meeting Minutes of

Thursday, June 8, 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, Shane Nieves

Staff: Beth Celeste, Tiffany Dominique, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Mari Ross-Russell, Kevin Trinh

Call to Order: M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:09 p.m.

Introductions: M. Cappuccilli asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda:

M. Cappuccilli referred to the June 2023 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned; M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the June Nominations agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor. The June 2023 agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (May 11th, 2023):

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

Report of Co-chairs:

None.

Report of Staff:

D. Law and S. Moletteri reviewed the progress report from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). The report made improvements to the demographics section by adding new options for individuals to identify as non-binary or other gender identities. D. Law credited M. Ross-Russell for this inclusion, recalling that they had discussed the issue in a previous Nominations Committee meeting where S. Nieves had expressed concern about the lack of gender inclusivity in the HRSA report. M. Ross-Russell mentioned that she had meetings with the project officer of the report and had brought to her attention S. Nieves' concerns. The project officer agreed to consider the feedback and made the necessary adaptations.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they needed to change their own application forms to be more inclusive. D. Law responded that no changes were necessary since their application forms already included inclusive language.

Discussion Items:

-HIPC Attendance Sheet Review-

The Nominations Committee reviewed the attendance sheet for the HIV Integrated Planning Council (HIPC) for the period of September 2022 to August 2023. D. Law explained that the red letters indicated members who had been absent for three or more consecutive meetings. She reminded the committee of the HIPC attendance policy, which stated that members could be removed from HIPC if they missed three consecutive meetings or a total of five meetings in a calendar year. The attendance spreadsheet indicated whether a member was present (marked with a "P"), absent and unexcused (marked with an "A"), or absent but excused (marked with an "E"). Members who did not meet the attendance policy were highlighted in purple, while new members were highlighted in green. The spreadsheet also listed the subcommittee each member was attached to.

M. Cappuccilli asked if attendance was counted based on registration or actual attendance at the meetings. S. Moletteri explained that attendance was recorded based on who was present at the meeting. She acknowledged that some members registered but did not attend, while others may join the meeting at different times. M. Cappuccilli noted that they would not have the complete attendance data until the end of the meeting, and S. Moletteri confirmed this. She mentioned that they tried to capture attendance as accurately as possible by checking attendees on Zoom throughout the meeting, but members could always correct any errors in future meetings. The only challenge they faced was if a member joined the meeting using a phone number, as their name would not appear. S. Moletteri stated that they would usually ask the members to identify themselves to ensure accurate attendance.

L. Diaz pointed out that she was marked absent in the December meeting incorrectly. D. Law asked K. Trinh to make a note of the correction. S. Moletteri explained that the error may have occurred during the transition of roles between K. Trinh and S. Moletteri.

M. Cappuccilli asked how they would address the list of absences and whether they would reach out to members who had been absent. D. Law suggested having a discussion on improving the attendance of new members first and then addressing individual members afterward. M. Ross-Russell mentioned that T. Dominique had already reached out to some new members to gather additional information from them. T. Dominique confirmed that she had contacted two members but was unable to reach the third. C. Steib had advised her to continue trying. T. Dominique also sent an email to all Prevention Committee members to solicit feedback, and one of the members replied to the email, indicating no issues with attendance or participation. T. Dominique noted that this member attended the last HIPC meeting, though it was unclear if her contact had influenced their attendance. Generally, members did not indicate any problems attending or participating in meetings when contacted.

D. Law explained how they would review member attendance, elaborating on M. Cappuccilli's description. They would identify members with sparse attendance and have someone from the

Nominations Committee who knew the member reach out to them. D. Law made a note of the members T. Dominique had already contacted.

The committee proceeded to review each member's attendance record. The first member they reviewed had some absences initially but had been attending recent meetings. L. Diaz mentioned that they were absent at the beginning of their term due to a family emergency. D. Law asked if this member needed more guidance since they were technically not a new member. L. Diaz explained that they had requested to be removed from HIPC due to feeling overwhelmed. L. Diaz offered to reach out to them since they lived and worked nearby. The committee agreed that this was a good idea.

For the next member with attendance violations, S. Moletteri stated that they had shifting priorities and schedules but still had an interest in attending meetings and attended any meetings they signed up for. S. Moletteri said she would personally reach out to them to discuss attendance. M. Cappuccilli suggested that they may just need a reminder of the HIPC attendance policy. L. Diaz speculated that they may have mistakenly believed that attending one meeting met the monthly requirement.

D. Law reviewed the next individual's attendance and confirmed that they met the attendance requirements.

T. Dominique said for the next member, she had reached out to them via email since she didn't have phone numbers for the members. D. Law noted that this member had been absent at the beginning of their term but had attended recent meetings. She asked the committee if they should continue trying to contact them. The committee agreed to determine the next steps after the HIPC meeting since T. Dominique had already spoken with them twice and confirmed interest in participating in HIPC.

M. Cappuccilli asked about the next member's situation. T. Dominique mentioned that she had met with them but couldn't determine why attendance wasn't frequent enough. M. Cappuccilli noted that they had recently had three absences in a row and suggested waiting to see their attendance at the HIPC meeting today before looking into their attendance further. T. Dominique confirmed that they were involved in a subcommittee but hadn't been attending that committee recently either. She believed their attendance in HIPC meetings would align with subcommittee attendance.

M. Cappuccilli inquired about the possibility of having a formal attendance sheet report for subcommittees in the next few months. D. Law stated that it depended on when K. Trinh would be able to complete the attendance sheets for the subcommittees.

Next, the committee discussed two members who had attendance issues. D. Law mentioned that the first individual was still responsive but hadn't been attending meetings. M. Cappuccilli pointed out that the other individual was in a similar situation.

The committee reviewed the attendance of each new member. They mentioned that the first member was not present during the initial meetings, and L. Diaz explained that it was likely due to a family emergency. D. Law clarified that this person was not a new member but had been recently reappointed. L. Diaz offered to reach out, though she had previously contacted them without success. The committee agreed that another attempt should be made. Regarding the next new member, they initially cited technological issues as a reason for not attending meetings but later mentioned personal issues. M. Cappuccilli recalled that he had called them before each meeting.

M. Ross-Russell believed that member attendance might be influenced by their comfort level with using Zoom and virtual meetings. She mentioned the need to schedule an Executive Committee meeting to establish parameters, including creating a zone where people could appear physically but remain anonymous. Eventually, they planned to have hybrid meetings, but they first needed to determine the requirements and adhere to city and state guidelines, taking into account COVID-19 and social distancing measures. M. Ross-Russell emphasized the importance of ensuring that members attending in-person meetings were aware of the rules.

T. Dominique noted that the Emergency HIPC meeting was included on the attendance sheet and asked if it counted towards the attendance requirements since it occurred on a week when HIPC wouldn't usually meet. D. Law clarified that the Emergency HIPC meeting was entirely optional and did not affect attendance standings. She explained that those not meeting the requirements would still not meet them even with the Emergency HIPC meeting. Regarding absences, D. Law stated that the Bylaws didn't specify whether they were based on the calendar year or planning year. She mentioned that they typically looked at absences within a year or a year and a half. M. Ross-Russell clarified that the planning cycle began and ended in September, aligning with the submission of grant applications. D. Law explained that the Nominations Committee judged attendance based on the overall year and the previous six months. M. Ross-Russell further clarified the fiscal cycles for the Ryan White program and the Prevention-related program, which influenced the planning cycle. D. Law stated that they could include as many months as needed for evaluating attendance sheets.

D. Law asked if the committee had reached out to another member listed. M. Cappuccilli replied that he hadn't, but D. Law remembered them being a good member and part of the Prevention Committee. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had attended any subcommittee meetings, but D. Law could only confirm attendance at Nominations Committee meetings. S. Moletteri recalled that they had attended a Comprehensive Planning (CPC) meeting but not in a while. D. Law suggested reaching out to them, and M. Cappuccilli volunteered.

K. Trinh said the next individual had emailed him in February that they were no longer able to attend meetings because they had moved out of Philadelphia. S. Moletteri asked if they had resigned from HIPC. K. Trinh did not have a conclusive answer. D. Law asked K. Trinh to forward the emails of resigned members to her for review. K. Trinh said he would be able to.

D. Law inquired if any of the committee members had contact with the next member under review or anyone who represented them. M. Cappuccilli said he had not. D. Law asked if they

were attending the Finance Committee meetings. M. Cappuccilli confirmed that they had not. D. Law asked the committee for their plan of action. M. Cappuccilli volunteered to reach out to this member because they were a very active member in the past.

For the next councilmember, D. Law mentioned that they were in communication but not attending meetings. D. Law noted that she would keep this member in mind but probably not reach out to them again.

D. Law moved onto the next member and explained that they had technology issues similar to some other members, resulting in non-attendance. L. Diaz asked if they would return to meetings if their technology issues were resolved, to which D. Law replied that they probably would. L. Diaz mentioned this member and another member, inquiring if anyone was in contact with them. D. Law mentioned that she had seen both of them a couple of months ago. Specifically, she recalled seeing the first member more recently in front of the convention center around March or April but had not stopped to talk to them.

D. Law then asked L. Diaz about the next member's attendance record. L. Diaz replied that this member was away for health reasons at the moment. When the committee asked if they should change this member's record from absent to excused, L. Diaz said it wasn't necessary. She had previously reached out to this member but couldn't convince them to attend meetings.

D. Law stated that they would remove inactive members during the fall when they review the attendance sheets again. However, after reviewing the attendance records, D. Law concluded that if they removed members in violation of the HIPC attendance policy, they would fall below the legally required number of members. As a result, they would need to recruit more unaligned members to avoid violating their Bylaws and the legislation.

-Buddy/Mentor Continue-

M. Cappuccilli asked M. Ross-Russell if she had received any suggestions from new members. M. Ross-Russell replied that she had not. M. Cappuccilli then asked D. Law if she had reviewed the ideas discussed in the last meeting and if she had any questions. D. Law mentioned that L. Diaz had informed her about the committee's consideration of adopting the Pennsylvania HIV Planning Group's pod-style mentor system and increasing engagement with all members. M. Cappuccilli explained that the member pod mentorship idea aimed to educate new members while also engaging and retaining all members.

D. Law mentioned that they had previously implemented a mentor-buddy system and pulled up a document outlining the roles and responsibilities of mentors. M. Cappuccilli asked when and where the document was created. L. Diaz believed it was created when they first introduced the mentor-buddy system. D. Law clarified that the mentor-buddy system was created as an optional engagement system for new members and was not mandatory. M. Cappuccilli recalled that it provided an alternative to having a buddy if the engagement was not necessary. The initial system allowed new members to seek clarification or assistance from any person rather than just one assigned mentor. D. Law asked whether they should continue with the mentor-buddy system or focus on other ideas to increase member engagement.

M. Ross-Russell suggested creating a place where members could access staff emails. She explained that there was a distinction between a new member asking a mentor a question and a member seeking help from staff. She proposed directing new members to contact staff for assistance, while mentors or members willing to help others could reach out to staff to determine how they could provide support. D. Law remarked that M. Ross-Russell's idea sounded similar to one they had discussed previously. They had asked veteran members to volunteer as mentors and then messaged new members to determine if they wanted a mentor. D. Law remembered that one person had requested a mentor. M. Ross-Russell emphasized that the difference was that new members wouldn't have to actively search for a mentor and would have the necessary tools to seek help if desired.

M. Cappuccilli asked if M. Ross-Russell would be willing to return a call if he wanted to contact her. M. Ross-Russell confirmed that she would. D. Law highlighted some key differences between contacting staff and having a mentor. Contacting staff could be intimidating while reaching out to a mentor felt more like approaching another member. Additionally, mentors proactively checked in with the member, whereas contacting staff required the new member to take the initiative. M. Cappuccilli suggested expanding on M. Ross-Russell's idea by providing new members with the option to contact either a mentor or staff member. D. Law questioned what they would do if a new member did not want a mentor. M. Cappuccilli explained that contacting a mentor or staff member would be optional.

M. Ross-Russell commented that it would depend on the individual. She stated that most staff members were approachable and willing to help, as it was part of their responsibilities to answer questions. If someone asked her a question about allocations or another topic, she would provide an answer. If K. Trinh received a question about allocations, he could direct the person to M. Ross-Russell for further information. M. Ross-Russell connected this to M. Cappuccilli's goal of increasing engagement, emphasizing that sometimes engagement could be as simple as having a conversation and gaining a better understanding of a topic.

M. Cappuccilli asked if new members would be able to call a mentor or staff member at any time. M. Ross-Russell said that could be part of the idea, but they needed to ensure that all members, including both new and veteran members, were willing to participate in such communication.

D. Law mentioned that D. Jack had expressed interest in having a mentor, and C. Steib informally became their mentor since they worked in the same agency. D. Law noted that they needed to gauge the comfort level of members in such arrangements. M. Ross-Russell pointed out that the issue seemed to be the lack of formality. Her idea was more informal because members didn't have to contact staff directly, but rather staff members would provide their email addresses when necessary.

D. Law asked for confirmation on what their final idea was. M. Ross-Russell proposed adding staff email addresses to the HIPC agenda and including the contact information of committee staff in their respective committee agendas. Members could be instructed to contact staff if they had questions, and any further questions could be addressed in the staff report. She acknowledged that they couldn't implement this idea immediately but could inform and answer

questions in the staff report. D. Law suggested including the email addresses in the next HIPC staff report. M. Cappuccilli agreed, stating that it was important enough to make it a discussion item. He also mentioned that this idea could replace the previous suggestion of office hours to assist new members. M. Ross-Russell suggested temporarily adding the email addresses to the HIPC chat box until a written proposal was created.

M. Ross-Russell raised the question of whether the process should be formal or not. She suggested sending an email to all members to let them know they could ask questions, as simply providing email addresses might not be formal enough. D. Law proposed sending an email to all members and adding the email addresses to the HIPC agenda. M. Ross-Russell added that they couldn't include it in the June HIPC meeting agenda but could include it in the staff report.

M. Ross-Russell mentioned that there would be no HIPC meeting in July due to the allocations meetings. D. Law asked if they would have a Nominations Committee meeting. M. Ross-Russell replied that they would typically not have any other meetings during the allocations meetings.

M. Cappuccilli suggested tabling the office hours and other ideas until they saw the outcome of M. Ross-Russell's idea to distribute staff email addresses. D. Law agreed, mentioning that since there would be no meeting in July, they could observe how the idea develops. She also reminded the committee that they needed to review applications in August, as many members' terms were about to expire. M. Cappuccilli proposed reminding members, when providing them with staff email addresses, that they could ask questions throughout the meeting and not feel limited to a specific time. M. Ross-Russell agreed and added that they could still meet on Fridays, depending on the comfort level of the members. D. Law mentioned that they had previously held office hours on Wednesdays, where they opened a Zoom room for an hour. M. Ross-Russell clarified that those office hours were specifically for allocations. D. Law suggested that they could consider office hours for June or July during the allocations period. M. Ross-Russell noted that this was different from the email idea since it involved scheduling a specific meeting time rather than allowing people to contact staff at any time via email. D. Law agreed, stating that office hours could be in addition to email communication.

To clarify, D. Law asked if the office hours meetings had been effective before, as they used to have allocations meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays with office hours on Wednesdays. M. Cappuccilli expressed that M. Ross-Russell's idea of providing staff email addresses would be sufficient, and they may not need to continue with office hours. However, he suggested considering the office hours if the staff became overwhelmed by emails. He then turned to L. Diaz for her opinion. L. Diaz agreed.

Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion: L. Diaz motioned, and M. Cappuccilli seconded to adjourn the June 2023 Nominations Committee meeting. Motion passed: Meeting adjourned at 1:26 p.m**

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- June 2023 Agenda
- May 2023 Meeting Minutes