

# MEETING AGENDA

## *VIRTUAL:*

*Thursday, May 14th, 2026*

*12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.*

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (April 9th, 2026)
- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs
- ◆ Report of Staff
- ◆ Discussion items
  - Orientation
  - Survey Review
- ◆ Other Business
- ◆ Announcements
- ◆ Adjournment

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

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • [www.hivphilly.org](http://www.hivphilly.org)

The next Nominations Committee meeting is

**VIRTUAL: June 11th, 2026 12:00pm - 2pm**

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

## **HYBRID: Nominations Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes of Thursday, April 9th, 2026 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** J. Baez (Co-Chair), T. Burroughs, D. D'Alessandro, J. Ealy, A. Edelstein, S. Heaven, A. Manley, S. Smith, D. Surplus

**Staff:** Tiffany Dominique, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh, Kristin Wilson (Intern)

**Call to Order:** J. Baez called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

**Introductions:** J. Baez asked for introductions. Those on Zoom introduced themselves via the chat, and those in person verbally introduced themselves.

#### **Approval of Agenda:**

J. Baez referred to the April 2026 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion:** J. Ealy motioned; D. D'Alessandro seconded to approve the April 2026 agenda. A poll was launched and those in the room voted with a show of hands to record the votes. Motion passed: 7 in favor. The April 2026 Nominations Committee agenda was approved.

#### **Approval of Minutes (March 12th, 2026):**

J. Baez referred to the March 2026 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion:** A. Manley motioned; D. Surplus seconded to approve the March 2026 meeting minutes. A poll was launched and those in the room voted with a show of hands to record the votes. Motion passed: 7 in favor, 1 abstained. The March 2026 Nominations Committee meeting minutes were approved.

#### **Report of Co-chairs:**

None.

#### **Report of Staff:**

T. Dominique said they had a training event on April 29th from 9am-11am and the event would be focused on interpreting the financial spreadsheets used in the Allocations Process. She welcomed all members to sign up for the event. She said that of the 19 people who already signed up for the event, the majority were HIV Integrated Planning Council (HIPC) members who had recently received their recommendation letter.

#### **Discussion Items:**

##### ***-Open Nominations Process-***

D. Law explained the Open Nominations Process. She explained they needed six members to form a quorum. If there aren't enough members, then the members present can vote to move forward without a quorum. Since they met quorum requirements today, the members can

proceed to review each application for membership and then vote to recommend or reject the applicant. She thanked the members for sending the eight scoresheets used to review the applicants. For this Open Nominations, they had four applications to review. Each applicant was scored by each member and assigned a score based on the average between all scoresheets submitted. The highest possible score was 16.

Applicant #171, with a score of 14.1, was reviewed first. D. Law said this member was Non-Hispanic Black male and had a PhD in Divinity. J. Baez said he scored this applicant well. He asked if the applicant had disclosed their sexual orientation and HIV status. D. Law said the applicant had withheld their sexual orientation but he did disclose that they were HIV negative. J. Baez and D. D'Alessandro said they didn't have any concerns about the individual and moved forward with a vote.

J. Baez motioned. A. Edelstein seconded the motion to begin the vote for this applicant. S. Moletteri opened the polling for voting. After all members had voted, applicant #171 had been recommended to the Mayor's Office for appointment to HIPC with 9 votes in favor.

Applicant #172 was assigned a score of 13.3. J. Baez said the applicant's demographics were not what they were looking for as they aimed to have the demographics of HIPC match the HIV epidemic. The applicant was a Non-Hispanic white woman who represented Ryan White (RW) Part C & D services and had a partnership with Drexel University. D. Law said this person might be the only person to represent Part C. J. Baez said he would recommend this person if they were the only person in their representation. D. Law said that if they recommended all the candidates today, the number of HIPC members would rise to 42.

HIPC was required to have a certain percentage of their members be unaligned people with HIV (PWH). If they continue adding people who were not PWH, the percentage of the membership who were unaligned PWH would drop. T. Dominique said their project officer had communicated that it required that they maintain a certain percentage of the membership be unaligned PWH. Currently HIPC had about a 19% representation of unaligned consumers in the membership. HRSA had wanted the representation to meet at least 33%. T. Dominique said she believed the influx of providers applying for HIPC membership could be due to the current political climate where funding could be removed at a moment's notice. She said providers could be feeling uneasy and they could believe it would benefit their organization to get an internal perspective on how funding was shifted.

J. Baez motioned. A. Edelstein seconded the motion to begin the vote for this applicant. S. Moletteri launched the poll. Eight members were in favor. One person had abstained. Applicant #172 was recommended for appointment to HIPC.

Applicant #173 had a score of 15.4 and was a Non-Hispanic Black woman from Philadelphia. The applicant was a reapplication. D. Law said this applicant had been attending meetings, specifically the Comprehensive Planning Committee. J. Ealy asked if the Office of HIV Planning would alert the panel if they received an application with glaring concerns. D. Law confirmed that they would. The Open Nominations Panel found no issue with the applicant and proceeded to move to a vote.

D. D'Alessandro motioned, J. Baez seconded to begin the vote for this applicant. S. Moletteri launched the poll. The panel voted to recommend the applicant with 8 in favor and 1 abstained.

Applicant #174 was a reapplicant with a score of 15.8 and they were a Non-Hispanic Black person from Philadelphia. D. Law said this individual was having attendance issues, but otherwise they didn't see any glaring issues.

J. Ealy motioned, A. Edelstein seconded to begin the vote for this applicant. S. Moletteri launched the poll. The applicant was recommended by the panel with 9 votes in favor.

T. Burroughs asked what would happen if they continued to be out of compliance with the requirement to have 33% of the membership be unaligned consumers. He wondered if they had already reached out to all unaligned consumers who were willing to participate. D. Law said they used to have more members during meetings, but this had changed once HIPC had transitioned to virtual meetings. T. Burroughs questioned if they may need to turn away participants who may not meet their demographic criteria. T. Dominique said this was a question the Open Nominations Panel determined where they should forward. She believed that regardless of what choice they had, they still faced greater challenges in increasing participation in HIPC in terms of recruitment and engagement. S. Moletteri reminded the committee that attending meeting likely posed a greater burden on unaligned consumers than providers. Unlike providers who may have employers sanction time of their workday to attend meetings, unaligned consumers may have to take time off to attend meetings. J. Baez asked if they could move the schedule of the meetings to be more convenient for their members. S. Moletteri said there had been internal discussions within the OHP staff about this topic. For the time being, they advised the Open Nominations Panel to table discussion on this topic for a later date.

#### ***-Release of Information-***

T. Dominique said they had received the appointment letters from the Mayor's Office with the exception of five applicants. She asked the panel members what they would like the OHP staff to do with these five applicants who were not accepted by the Mayor's Office. These applicants were not sent because to date they had not given consent to release information about their home address as part of their application. J. Baez asked if there was a way to contact these members and see if they would send their information. T. Dominique said they had contacted three people but received no response. Two other people had replied back to their email but they did not answer the question. D. D'Alessandro asked if the OHP staff had considered calling the remaining applicants through a phone call.

J. Ealy asked if they could contact the people during a HIPC meeting if we knew they were attending meetings. D. Law said it was possible the persons do not want to release this information. D. D'Alessandro said they could simply state during the meeting in a public announcement that there were a couple individuals who have not disclosed their information and that these individuals should contact T. Dominique to resolve this issue. She emphasized that they should withhold the names of the individuals during this announcement. T. Burroughs said they should keep in mind the effort that the recommended members had invested in HIPC up to this point and remember that the HIPC members were volunteers. T. Dominique said that they

had contacted these individuals before through a private message but the members had not responded during the HIPC meetings. S. Moletteri asked T. Dominique to further clarify for the members why the city government was requesting more information from the recommended members. T. Dominique explained that the Philadelphia City Government wanted to ensure that all recommended members from Philadelphia had no outstanding debt to the city. D. D'Alessandro replied that they should be more open that the city government would perform a background check during the application process. T. Dominique agreed. She mentioned that Dr. Brady has said in the past that HIPC should not be held to the same requirements of other boards..

S. Moletteri asked the members to confirm if they wanted the OHP staff to make the announcement during the next HIPC meeting and to reach out to the applicants mentioned above. The attending members agreed this should be their next course of action. D. Law asked how long they should keep the recommended members who have declined to forward their information. T. Dominique said the five people would no longer be recommended members if they did not release their information to the city. D. Law asked how long they intend to keep individuals who do not release their information. J. Ealy suggested they keep them as recommended members for 3 months. D. Law said the standard procedure was to keep them as recommended members for 6 months while they tried to procure the necessary information from them. S. Smith said they could only do so much and suggested a stricter deadline of 30-40 days before removal. D. Law said they could give more leeway for unaligned members. T. Burroughs said they wanted active and engaged members in HIPC. He felt that numbers on a spreadsheet wouldn't benefit HIPC or the constituents who they represented.

S. Moletteri launched a poll to determine how long a member could be considered a recommended member without releasing their information. The options on the poll were 2 weeks, 4 weeks/30 days and 45 days. Five out of the seven members or 57% of the vote elected for 4 weeks or 30 days.

J. Ealy asked if they had a document detailing what information the city government was asking for and what the information was being used for. T. Dominique said the city government's request was made verbally and was not in writing. T. Burroughs said he believed it was not outside of their scope to ask what the information was being used for. D. D'Alessandro said requesting this information in writing would be to the benefit of both the city government and HIPC as other boards in the city would likely face similar issues in the future. T. Burroughs said he could ask if his colleagues received a similar request from the Mayor's Office.

#### ***-Orientation-***

D. Law said they were hoping Orientation would be in-person this year and asked how the panel would approach this topic. She said they were aiming to have the Orientation in May. J. Baez asked how in-person Orientations were handled in the past. D. Law described the Orientation event as an icebreaker they had in-person with the purpose of increasing attendance among members. New members would be engaged through games and bonding that was more difficult to achieve online. D. Law said the COVID-19 pandemic had disrupted this HIPC rite of passage by forcing all meetings to be virtual. D. Law asked if they should resume Orientation as an in-person event. D. D'Alessandro voiced her support for this idea. She said the only reason

people could attend virtually was if they had a barrier that prevented them from attending in-person. T. Burroughs said if this was the case, it was easier to have two events instead of one catering to two different priorities. K. Carter said that if they do intend to have the event be hybrid, people attending virtually should have their cameras turned on. S. Moletteri said they normally had the cameras turned off during meetings due to confidentiality reasons. During meetings, it was standard practice to record the meeting and some members may be sensitive about being recorded at a meeting about HIV. D. D'Alessandro agreed that they could have a second orientation on Zoom but everyone had to have their cameras turned on because they were not being recorded during Orientation.

T. Dominique asked a few logistical questions about the in-person Orientation. She asked how long the Orientation would be and if they needed to have catering at this event. She then reminded the panel they decided to have the Orientation on the same time slot as their regular Nominations Committee meetings, that they would be holding the event right before the HIPC meeting. She said that the May and June 2026 HIPC were crucial meetings where they were aiming to have as many members in-person to ask questions about the Integrated Plan. They would be voting on concurrence with the plan in June. She cautioned that hosting the event and transitioning to a substantial HIPC meeting could amount to five hours of meetings with little relief. D. D'Alessandro agreed and said it was not a good idea to exhaust their members on what would be their first official day as full-fledged HIPC members. T. Dominique said they should send the recommended members a date and then decide the date on their availability. J. Ealy asked if we could delay Orientation. S. Moletteri said they hesitated to delay Orientation because some of the recommended members had been waiting over a year for their appointment letters. T. Dominique asked if the panel wanted to hold the Orientation during the first week of May. D. Law said the first week of May would conflict with the Aging and Thriving Symposium at the DoubleTree Hotel on May 5th. Additionally, T. Dominique said they would have at least one staff member who would not be available during the period of May 11th to June 1st. J. Ealy said it would be better to have the Orientation in June. D. Law said they should come up with dates for both May and June to decide the date of the Orientation. The panel members agreed they would choose some dates and then decide through a poll.

**- Member Survey-**

K. Trinh had created two surveys to evaluate the HIPC meeting quality. He said there was one survey for recommended members and another survey for the general membership. The survey would ask the member what subcommittee they would join and what events they would like to see in the future. The second survey asked what was the best time for meetings. The purpose of this survey was to gauge sentiment on whether members had wanted to move the meetings dates and times.

Due to time constraints, the Nominations Committee would review the survey at the next meeting. K. Trinh would send out the survey after the meeting for review and comment to the Nominations Committee.

**Other Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

J. Baez adjourned at 1:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- April 2026 Nominations Committee Agenda
- March 2026 Nominations Committee Minutes

DRAFT