

**Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Nominations Committee  
Meeting Minutes of  
Thursday, August 8, 2019  
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:** Juan Baez, Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Lupe Diaz, Steven Zick

**Excused:** Sharee Heaven, Samuel Romero (Co-Chair), Gloria Taylor

**Call to Order:**

M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:16 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda:**

M. Cappuccilli presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz moved, S. Zick seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

**Approval of Minutes:**

M. Cappuccilli presented the July 2019 meeting minutes for approval. The minutes were approved by general consensus.

**Report of Chair:**

No report.

**Report of Staff:**

No report.

**Discussion Items**

- **Report Back on Attendance Violations**

D. Law reminded those present that they had reviewed attendance the previous month, and sent out four removal letters plus eight warning letters. She noted that some group members had volunteered to contact those receiving warning letters. She stated that G. Taylor had contacted L. Wellington, and L. Wellington would be resigning.

L. Diaz stated that she had contacted J. Horan about her attendance. She noted J. Horan had a number of conflicts but would try to attend in the future. D. Law noted that J. Horan had said she would try to come to that day's Planning Council meeting. L. Diaz added that she had conveyed the importance of representation for the PA Counties.

L. Diaz noted that she had emailed L. Jones, but had not heard back. D. Law stated that she had also not heard from L. Jones, whose term was expiring in September.

D. Law stated that she had not heard back from G. Matthews, but that she had asked D. Gana to reach out to him. She noted that she had also reached out to J. Murdock, E. Sargent, and G.

Thomas and had not heard back. She added that T. Flores-Sanchez had attended the last Nominations Committee meeting but was not present at the last Planning Council meeting.

D. Law stated that she had sent removal letters to Z. Wesley and D. McBride-Wesley, who had not responded. She stated that she had also sent removal letters to J. Simmons and P. Gorman, who had responded via email. She noted that she had invited both to appeal to the committee in person, later during the current meeting. The committee members individually reviewed the email responses.

M. Cappuccilli confirmed the appeal process. He explained that they had previously heard appeals as a group, then further discussed each case after the person appealing left the room. He added that they typically notified the member of their decision later.

L. Diaz asked for the information about the attendance records. J. Baez stated that J. Simmons had had seven absences, of which six were unexcused, including three consecutive absences. He noted that P. Gorman had excused absences for six meetings. D. Law reminded the group that a member was subject to removal after five total absences or three consecutive unexcused absences over the course of a planning year.

J. Baez asked how the group would determine whether to accept an appeal. He suggested that they ask anyone appealing to attend the next three consecutive meetings. M. Cappuccilli noted that P. Gorman's appeal included notification that she may miss more meetings. J. Baez stated that they needed to communicate why attendance is important. He noted that membership was not required in order to attend meetings, although non-members could not vote. B. Morgan stated that the Planning Council had developed the current attendance policy because they had decided that members could not make informed votes if they missed half of the meetings in a year. M. Cappuccilli stated that those in violation of the attendance policy could simply attend meetings as a non-voting community member.

The group then discussed J. Simmons' appeal email. The group decided that they would likely offer the opportunity to stay on if he attended the next three consecutive meetings, assuming he appealed during the current meeting. The group also agreed to reach out to a former Planning Council member from the same organization to conduct targeted recruitment.

- **Next Steps for Fall Open Nominations**

The group reviewed current Planning Council demographics as well as the ideal membership composition. D. Law noted that the breakout assumed that they would remove all of the members currently pending removal, but still included a member who had resigned recently. She added that there were six members with terms expiring in September. She stated that they currently had nine applications, including one from an applicant who was no longer with their agency and had not responded to contact. L. Diaz asked how many of the applications were strong. D. Law replied that at least half were strong, and that two of them had replied to an invitation to attend that day's Planning Council meeting. She noted that the deadline for applications for fall appointment would be August 30. L. Diaz stated that she had gotten a call that an applicant she had contacted would be applying.

D. Law stated that they would have gaps to fill, reminding those present that they needed to approve at least one unaffiliated consumer for every two providers.

D. Law noted that five of the nine applications were missing the tax clearance. L. Diaz stated that she brought this up frequently, but that this tax clearance was a barrier to recruitment.

D. Law reminded those present that they would have an application review panel at their next Nominations Committee meeting. She noted that this would be a closed panel since they review individuals' information.

- **Attendance Violation Appeals**

P. Gorman joined the meeting. J. Baez explained that they valued P. Gorman's contributions, and had sent her a removal letter because the maximum number of absences allowed was five. He noted that he understood that there were some extenuating circumstances that prevented her from attending. P. Gorman stated that she had a series of procedures and was working from home for some time. She noted that she would have more conflicts in the future, and that she was also traveling for work. M. Cappuccilli asked if it would make more sense to have someone else from her agency as a voting member, while she could still attend allocations as a non-voting members. P. Gorman stated that she had asked colleagues to apply before, but that their applications had been rejected. D. Law noted that there had previously been more members from New Jersey. P. Gorman stated that it did not seem as though there had been sufficient representation from New Jersey in the past. She went on to say that she had been able to make some changes to her work schedule, which had allowed her to attend more meetings after her procedures. S. Zick noted that they valued P. Gorman's presence at meetings.

P. Gorman stated that she would be able to attend meetings if they held meetings via conference call. D. Law stated that they did have meetings available by conference call. B. Morgan noted that conference calling was available for committee meetings. She clarified that calling in was only provided upon request, and was not available for Planning Council meetings. P. Gorman stated that she had a number of other obligations, but that she prioritized attending meetings when she did not have a conflict. M. Cappuccilli asked if there would be anyone from her organization who would reliably be able to attend. P. Gorman stated that it could be difficult because she works with clinical providers, who would need to not see patients in order to attend Planning Council meetings.

P. Gorman stated that she did not take this responsibility lightly. She went on to say that she had thought that this year would be better in terms of her work schedule, but that she had also had medical issues this year. She added that she had not received the removal letter in a timely manner, due to issues with mail routing at her workplace.

M. Cappuccilli noted that this was P. Gorman's second appeal, so they would need to consider that in their deliberations. P. Gorman stated that she was always happy to contribute.

The group then privately discussed the appeal. The group agreed that not everyone might be aware that the Planning Council had a leave of absence policy. L. Diaz stated that she would announce this during that day's meeting. S. Zick stated that it was important to consider that attendance would be a recurring issue. J. Baez agreed, explaining that he understands why the issue happened but that it was likely to happen again.

The group then reviewed P. Gorman's past attendance record. D. Law noted that P. Gorman's term would expire in March 2021. She reminded the group that P. Gorman had also appealed last fall, and that the group had agreed to bring her back onto the Planning Council when she reapplied for membership.

The group agreed to accept P. Gorman's appeal, on the condition that she could have only one (excused) absence from August through December 2019. D. Law confirmed that she would send a letter to this effect.

The group agreed to continue recruitment efforts in Southern New Jersey.

J. Baez stated that J. Simmons had not attended the appeal time slot. The group agreed that they would remove him and encourage him to reapply.

**Old Business:**

None.

**New Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

**Motion:** L. Diaz moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to adjourn the meeting at 1:50p.m. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Briana L. Morgan, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from July 11, 2019
- Ideal Membership Composition