

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Tuesday, January 16, 2024

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (August 29th, 2023)
- ◆ Report of Staff
- ◆ Discussion Item
 - Open Nominations Policy
 - Letter of Acknowledgement Process
- ◆ Other Business
- ◆ Announcements
- ◆ Adjournment

Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.

The next Executive Committee meeting is

TBD

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107

(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org

Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.

**Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Tuesday, August 29th, 2023
12:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

Present: Michael Cappuccilli, Keith Carter, Debra D'Alessandro, Lupe Diaz, Alan Edelstein, Gus Grannan, Adam Williams

Excused: Desiree Surplus, Clint Steib

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

Call to Order: K. Carter called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m.

Introductions: K. Carter skipped introductions.

Approval of Agenda:

K. Carter referred to the August 2023 Executive Committee agenda. S. Moletteri said the time on the agenda said A.M. instead of P.M. K. Carter said they should remove the report of co-chair from the agenda. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned; L. Diaz seconded to approve the amended August 2023 Executive Committee agenda. **Motion passed: 7 in favor.** The amended August 2023 agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (February 24th, 2023):

K. Carter referred to the February 2023 Committee minutes. **Motion:** G. Grannan motioned; G. Grannan seconded to approve the February 2023 meeting minutes. **Motion passed: All in favor.** The September 2022 Minutes were approved.

Report of Staff:

M. Ross-Russell met with Dr. Brady regularly. She had discussions about returning the staff to physical meetings full-time. She said they may be returning to mask requirements due to the increases in COVID-19 cases and due to the population they work with.

M. Cappuccilli asked what the work environment was. M. Ross-Russell said they would be working 3 days at home and in the office twice. M. Ross-Russell listed the schedule and noted it was staggered so they are not all in the office at the same time.

Discussion Item:

-Transition to Hybrid Meetings-

K. Carter said they should wear masks in the hallways. M. Ross-Russell said there was an issue with the ladies' room. It should be one person per bathroom since the ladies' room was a small restroom. She said the building had changed the security system and meeting attendees could not

open the door unless they had a cell phone and could call the office to let them in. M. Ross-Russell said OHP could also assign a staff person to open the door.

M. Ross-Russell said they had to account for social distancing and keep count of the number of people in attendance. Previously, they could have 80 people sitting next to each other in the large conference room. She also said the staff cannot ask if people were vaccinated since that would be problematic. L. Diaz asked what might happen if people refused to wear a mask. L. Diaz remembered when she asked people to wear a mask and almost got into a fight about it. K. Carter suggested they not let people in the building if they were not masked since this would be a safety issue for both staff and attendees. M. Ross-Russell said before they transition, they must account for every instance or consideration. She added that they have the option of online meetings.

T. Dominique reached out to council members to ask about whether they wanted hybrid meetings. She said most people were excited for in-person and willing to wear masks. She also mentioned how the New York HIV Planning Group has not fully turned to full hybrid meetings.

M. Cappuccilli did not believe they would fill up a room and that most people would elect to stay home. T. Dominique was concerned that they needed to avoid a dynamic where providers were at their desks while community members were in the room. She said that was one of the concerns that they had found when speaking to the New York EMA. K. Carter asked about the HIPC members and who could not attend virtual meetings due to digital barriers. T. Dominique knew of at least 5 people who faced this issue.

A. Williams asked if they could create library groups to have meetings. T. Dominique said they would need to send a request and then they could only have two meetings per year in a specific space. A. Williams suggested a revolving location. K. Carter asked if there was a place that would donate their space to HIPC. T. Dominique remembered that William Way's library may have some space there. She considered the issue of amount of space within the library's elevator and their bathroom situation.

When considering OHP's large conference room, M. Ross-Russell said they could fit 35 people at most, including staff persons. The issue was with spacing since social distancing protocol required 6 feet of space between each person. K. Carter asked if they could test physical meetings with a small committee such as the Positive Committee. He suggested that the Positive Committee might have the most issues with masks. M. Ross-Russell said the best group to test run in-person would probably be the Positive Committee. They would also need to consider accommodations. Additionally, individuals must also be comfortable with the idea of eating outside and not during the meeting.

L. Diaz said the PA HPG was doing hybrid meetings. M. Ross-Russell recalled that the state HPG was where C. Steib had gotten COVID-19. M. Cappuccilli asked if people were masking during those meetings. L. Diaz said there was no requirement. L. Diaz said she had not heard anyone else who had gotten COVID. D. D'Alessandro asked if M. Ross-Russell talked to Dr. K. Brady about the mask requirement and if there was any pushback since masks were not a requirement everywhere. M. Ross-Russell said that Dr. K. Brady believed that the city would reintroduce the mask mandate., if not for the whole city, PDPH for sure. T. Dominique said there

were questions about the laptop mic. There would be a mic next to the laptop and a staff member bringing a mic around to each member when they raised their hand to speak. She said there were 9 potential spaces lost because of staff and speakers. M. Ross-Russell said they could position themselves to have a maximum of 4 staff members since it would not be required for them to be in the room all at once.

M. Cappuccilli asked if they anticipated requests from members to register online or offline. M. Ross-Russell said they would need to register people and ask if they would attend in person or online. She said they have done meetings and presentations in the past where it was in person and online. M. Cappuccilli asked if they had the technology. M. Ross-Russell said they were having tech issues with the internet where they had contacted Comcast. They sent M. Ross-Russell a new router. Other than Wi-Fi, they could access Zoom through the network. She said they had the projector, Zoom, and microphones. Staff had a test run and it could be functional.

M. Ross-Russell mentioned that she would be on vacation in November. T. Dominique reminded the committee that the city would be sending out ads to have the COVID booster to keep people protected from the latest COVID-19 strain.

K. Carter asked if Drexel University would donate space for HIPC. T. Dominique did not believe so. M. Ross-Russell said they would first need to figure out how many people would attend in-person. Currently, HIPC has around 35 members. She said they may not need another space and that the issue was the basic stuff they had no control over such as elevators and bathrooms. Since the office was in Philadelphia, there were members from New Jersey and Pennsylvania counties who would likely be comfortable with attending virtually.

M. Ross-Russell said the committees would not be an issue and that only the full HIPC might present an issue. M. Ross-Russell said it might be better for presenters to be online. K. Carter asked about what might happen if someone contracted COVID at one of the HIPC meetings. M. Ross-Russell said it was the staff's responsibility to ensure everyone was wearing the masks and sticking to safety protocol.

T. Dominique said she was most concerned about how people would get into the building. She was also concerned that some people would need to drink water and be asked to put their masks back on. M. Ross-Russell was also concerned about the elevator. She said they would include safety instructions in the invitation.

Any Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

K. Carter called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion: D. D'Alessandro motioned, and A. Williams seconded to adjourn the Executive Committee meeting. Motion passed: All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- August 2023 Meeting Agenda
- February 2022 Meeting Minutes

DRAFT

Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council

Description of Open Nominations Process

Revised 8 May 2003 (updated May 2023)

The following steps shall be utilized to solicit, review, recommend, and appoint new members to the Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council. It is expected that this process will be utilized at least annually.

Step One. Solicitation of Members

The Office of HIV Planning advertises the availability of seats on the Planning Council through local media outlets and through distribution of applications at places where interested parties, particularly consumers, are likely to have access to them. The application shall include open-ended questions, an HIV disclosure form (for those applying for relevant seats), and conflict of interest information (including the Council's policy and disclosure form).

Step Two. Application Review

The Planning Council's Nominations Committee solicits members for and appoints an application review panel from among members of the Planning Council. 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. *The review panel shall recommend applicants for membership twice during the planning cycle, once in the spring and once in the fall period.* Utilizing objective criteria, each panel member completes an independent review of each blinded application reflecting whether or not an applicant should be appointed to the Planning Council. The review panel members evaluate each of the applicant's responses on the application separately, utilizing the following criteria:

Understanding of the Planning Council
Skills/Experiences of the Applicant Relative to HIV Care
Representational Needs of the Planning Council
Applicant's Clarity regarding their contribution to the Planning Council

Each panel member then scores each of the applicant's responses based upon the following range:

- 4= Clearly fulfills this criteria.
- 3= May fulfill this criteria.
- 2= May not fulfill this criteria.
- 1= Clearly does not fulfill this criteria.

The panel shall also consider the list of categorical seats that are to be filled, paying attention to demographics of the epidemic locally. The panel may consider additional documentation including, but not limited to, meeting attendance records for applicants seeking appointment for an additional term. Each panel member submits their ratings to the Office of HIV Planning staff. The staff tabulates results and develops a score sheet showing each reviewer's ratings for each applicant along with a cumulative rating for each applicant. The staff convenes a meeting of the review panel to discuss the applications and ratings. In assembling its recommendations for membership, the panel shall also consider the list of categorical seats that are to be filled, paying attention to demographics of the epidemic locally, as well as the applicants' cumulative rating.

The list of candidates, along with the group's overall rating for each, is then sent to the CEO (Chief Executive Officer for the Part A grant award) or the CEO's designee for consideration. The review panel may make additional recommendations to the CEO (such as a recommendation for representation by geographic area, recommending candidates for specific seats, etc.). This application review step may require more than one meeting of the review panel. If a member of the panel is applying for membership, they shall not review their own application nor be present during discussion of their candidacy.

Step Three. Review and Appointment by CEO or CEO's Designee

The CEO or designee reviews the panel's recommendations and, after full consideration, makes all appointment decisions. Each applicant is notified as to whether or not they are appointed and for what term length. Candidates not selected for appointment remain in the applicant pool for future consideration.

Step Four. Filling Vacancies

The CEO or designee fills vacancies from among candidates whose applications have been reviewed by the Council's review panel. If a vacancy arises for which there are few qualified applicants, the review panel may solicit additional applications for review and recommendation to the CEO or designee, utilizing the process described above. Applications may be submitted throughout the year; the application review panel may be convened as needed to review these applications so that candidates may be considered when filling vacancies.

Guidance and Considerations for Membership & Recommendation

- *Membership on the Planning Council shall not exceed more than two members of the same affiliation. The review panel shall consider applicants' affiliation(s) as an additional guidance of the nomination process, if there are more than one applicant and/or member of the same affiliation. (Spring 2007)*

- *Determination of applicants' area of representation: determination is based on whether the applicant represents their place of employment/the work that they do/their area of interest or as an individual. (April 2008)*
- *Sub-committee attendance policy (Article VI, Section 5): individuals who are in violation of the attendance policy will be removed from Planning Council. The Nominations Committee shall oversee and track the sub-committee attendance record noting members' attendance status and forwarding the notation to the respective sub-committee for further action. Co-chairs of the respective sub-committee will determine the individual's participation/contribution level and take appropriate action(s), with the removal of member carried out by the Nominations Committee. (May 2008)*
- *The committee shall recommend applicants for membership to the CEO or designee for official appointment of membership, understanding that the CEO or designee may or may not appoint all recommended applicants. During this process, recommended applicants shall attend an orientation and at least one scheduled RWPC meeting prior to their official appointment process. (February 2009)*
- *The committee may have a separate membership waiting list for unaligned consumers and others (i.e. providers). The waiting list would place qualified applicant(s) on "hold" until vacancy is available on the Planning Council. Applicants on hold will need to have attended meetings prior. (April 2009)*
- *Any resignation from members shall be reported to the Nominations Committee for formal documentation. (March 2010)*
- *Based on the attendance policy, members in violation will be removed. However, they will be given an opportunity to schedule an appeal in front of the Nominations Committee. The committee will require members who qualify for the appeal to commit and attend the next consecutive 5 council and sub-committee meetings in order to re-instate their membership (if the appeal is approved). (December 2017)*