

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Thursday May 12, 2022

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- Call to Order

- Welcome/Introductions

- Approval of Agenda

- Approval of Minutes (*April 14, 2022*)

- Report of Co-Chairs

- Report of Staff

- Discussion Item
 - New Member Support

- Other Business

- Announcements

- Adjournment

Nominations Committee

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

**Nominations Committee of the
HIV Integrated Planning Council
Virtual Meeting Minutes for
Thursday, April 14, 2022
12:00-2:00 p.m.**

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

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

Staff: Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Elijah Sumners

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

Approval of Agenda: M. Cappuccilli presented the April 2022 HIPC agenda for approval. **Motion:** S. Heaven motioned, L. Diaz seconded to approve the April 2022 agenda. **Motion passed: 5 in favor.**

Approval of Minutes (March 10, 2022): L. Diaz presented the previous meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion:** motioned to approve the minutes, K. Carter seconded to approve the April 2022 meeting minutes as amended. **Motion passed: 5 in favor**

Report of Co-Chairs:

No Report.

Report of Staff:

No Report.

Discussion Item:

—Scoring Applications—

D. Law reported that she received five scoring sheets. M. Cappuccilli asked why two applications stated they were still interested and did that come from a follow-up after applications were received? D. Law stated that she emailed them and S. Moletteri followed up with a phone call. D. Law stated that those who did not respond should be discussed first. L. Diaz asked if D. Law could point out which numbers corresponded with those who were uninterested in continuing the process so that they could be left out of discussions. D. Law stated that Number 52's email was not operational and there has not been any response from them, and this was an applicant from last round.

M. Cappuccilli stated that Number 54 was an incomplete application and asked D. Law if it had been completed in the time since it was sent to the Nominations Committee. S. Moletteri stated that they reached out to them and they stated they were still interested in joining; however, they did not complete the application.

D. Law presented the tally sheet that they would use as a voting mechanism. M. Cappuccilli suggested reviewing the applicants from highest to lowest scores and the group agreed. Applicant 53 was a former member reapplying, M. Cappuccilli asked if the reapplicant was a member in good standing. D. Law answered that they were given a warning in the past, but they were a consumer and OHP staff understood that they did not respond to email usually. The group agreed to recommend this reapplicant.

M. Cappuccilli reported that Number 58 was a current HIPC member reapplying, and asked D. Law if this individual was a member in good standing. D. Law responded affirmatively. M. Cappuccilli explained to S. Nieves that barring major attendance issues, most reapplicants were reinstated to their role on the council. Because the application process is anonymous the committee is dependent on information provided by staff to determine if there were past problems with attendance. Applicant Number 56 was an unaligned consumer. S. Nieves asked if people could go from the designation of “aligned” to “unaligned” if there was already agency representation? L. Diaz responded this was only the case if they were to leave their job, then they could be designated as unaligned. D. Law added that if the organization was a subrecipient of Ryan White funds and you were paid staff or a board member you were considered an aligned PLWH. L. Diaz explained that HRSA discussed in a meeting that if HIPC wanted to unalign or change how a person was categorized they would need to be put through the application process again.

M. Cappuccilli asked if Number 56 has been in communication with D. Law to which she responded that they responded to the initial email, but they have not attended a meeting. L. Diaz, M. Cappuccilli, J. Baez, and S. Nieves agreed to accept this applicant. M. Cappuccilli asked if Number 43 represented New Jersey, D. Law answered affirmatively. S. Moletterri stated that the current membership representation of New Jersey was 4 people and the ideal number was 7 people, and of this round of applications, this was the only person applying to represent New Jersey. Additionally, D. Law reported that this person applied in the last round as well. S. Nieves abstained from voting citing that it looked as if HIPC would be losing a person who worked at a Federally Qualifying Health Center and he thought it would be good to keep them. Number 43 was recommended.

M. Cappuccilli reported the next applicant was Number 57, an aligned consumer. D. Law stated that OHP has not been able to get in touch with this individual for awhile. D. Law stated that her concern was if the individual was not responding to emails from initial contact, then this could potentially lead to missing important communications related to orientation or meetings. M. Cappuccilli stated that because this person was a consumer and they've gone through the process of obtaining a tax certificate, they should be accepted. J. Baez asked if they were aligned does that number account for HRSA's 33% goal? D. Law answered that the person would count toward the HIPC goal of having 50% of the membership be PLWH, but it did not count toward the 33% legislative requirement. J. Baez asked when this application was submitted? D. Law answered that it was submitted February 17, 2022. The Nominations Committee voted 60/40 in favor of recommending this person to the planning council.

M. Cappuccilli reported that next applicant was Number 52 and asked D. Law if they had been in communication. D. Law answered that their email does not work and they did not call the office back after S. Moleterri left a voicemail, so they have never attended a meeting. She reported that this applicant was from last round and submitted their application on August 23, 2021 and there has not been communication since the submission. S. Nieves asked if this was pending tax clearance and D. Law answered that the reason could be either a yes or no. Obtaining a tax clearance was a requirement for any member recommendation to be made to the mayor's office. Number 52 was not recommended.

M. Cappuccilli reported that the next applicant Number 54 had an incomplete application, but S. Moleterri stated that they were still genuinely interested when they spoke recently. The applicant stopped answering after question 15 and the group determined to not recommend them.

Other Business:

M. Cappuccilli stated that the Nominations Committee discussed retention at the last meeting and predicted that this was going to be a big task for the committee to carry out. He asked to put retention on the agenda for next month. The discussion would be about how Nominations would deal with new members, before planning council meetings, how do we go forward with the implementation of those ideas?

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment:

M. Cappuccilli asked for a motion to adjourn. S. Heaven made a motion to adjourn, S. Nieves seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elijah Sumners