

**Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Nominations Committee  
Meeting Minutes of  
Tuesday, August 31, 2021  
12:00-2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Juan Baez, Mike Cappuccilli, Lupe Diaz, Sheree Heaven, Kate King

**Staff:** Julia Henrikson, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Elijah Sumners

**Call to Order:** M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 12:12 pm.

**Approval of Agenda:** L. Diaz presented the August 31, 2021 Nominations Committee agenda for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the August 2021 agenda. **Motion passed:** 83% in favor, 17% abstaining.

**Approval of Minutes (August 12, 2021):** M. Cappuccilli presented the previous meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, S. Heaven seconded to approve the August 12, 2021 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 75% in favor, 25% abstaining.

**Report of Chair:**

No report.

**Report of Staff:**

No report.

**Action Items:**

***---Review of New and Returning Applicants---***

D. Law explained the nomination and application process for the new additions to the Nominations Committee. This was a twice a year process which took place in the spring and fall, and potential members submit applications to the Office of HIV Planning. D. Law stated that they needed to increase consumer involvement because numbers were low due to people's terms ending. Additionally, D. Law emphasized the importance of what was needed on the planning council, especially consumer numbers. L. Diaz asked if you were a reapplicant but also seated on the Nominations Panel and scored applicants. D. Law explained that people will not vote on themselves to ensure fairness. M. Cappuccilli asked when will the accepted applicants be seated on the council? D. Law answered that due to COVID-19 last fall the group voted to extend the terms of those people whose terms were expiring in fall. OHP then asked for extension letters for terms ending in the spring. This is the first reconvening of the application review process since the spring of 2021.

K. King asked if there is a minimum or maximum number of members that HIPC are supposed

to have. D. Law answered there is a minimum of 35 and maximum of 55 members. The HRSA legislative language states that they need to have 33% unaligned consumers. Currently, HIPC has 36 members in total.

D. Law followed this up with a chart where it details the demographic breakdown (i.e. unaligned consumers, gender, race, etc.). Based on the chart for current membership, only 19% are consumers.

M. Cappuccilli noted that only two applicants were unaligned consumers. L. Diaz responded that HIPC was actively trying to better its recruitment efforts.

M. Cappuccilli asked about the breakdowns according to the scorecards. D. Law brought up the tally excel sheet, where the applicants are ranked based on the group's voting. M. Cappuccilli suggested that the group look at the reapplicants first to determine if there were issues with attendance that have hindered their participation. D. Law stated there is one person that fell into this category, but due to issues related to the digital divide they have not been in consistent communication with HIPC. M. Cappuccilli asked if it was possible to move all the reapplicants into an "Accepted" category through one vote. J. Baez and L. Diaz agreed, the latter with the caveat that some reapplicants demonstrated they were not as invested.

D. Law suggested that the group go through the applicants individually to ensure that each person's circumstances are accounted for properly.

Applicant #22 received a score of 15.33 out of 16 and was accepted unanimously.

Applicant #4 received a score of 15.25 out of 16, but was missing tax information; L. Diaz asked J. Baez if his agency was helping with tax information and he said yes, they just need to reach out to them. M. Cappuccilli stated that for the fall recruitment plan they need to take into consideration that the vast majority of new applicants represent Philadelphia County and HIPC needs congruent representation in the Pennsylvania and New Jersey counties.

Applicant #16 received a score of 15 out of 16, and approved for recommendation.

Applicant #17 was a new applicant; they received a provisional yes with the caveat that D. Law needs to reach out to confirm their residency status.

Applicant #18 is a returning applicant, and approved for recommendation.

Applicant #23 was a returning applicant, and approved for recommendation.

Applicant #20 was a returning applicant, and approved for recommendation.

Applicant #25 was a returning applicant, and approved for recommendation.

For Application #26, D. Law mentioned that they were returning & unaligned consumer-- they also needed help with the tax clearance process. Applicant #26 was a returning applicant, and

approved for recommendation.

Applicant #13 was a new applicant from New Jersey; M. Cappuccilli asked if this person was a Ryan White Part B recipient and D. Law said they were. Applicant #13 was approved for recommendation.

Applicant #14 was a new applicant (although they were a member of the council about 15 years ago) and an aligned consumer. The applicant was missing their tax certification and will need to submit it in order to be properly onboarded. Everyone agreed to approve applicant #14 for recommendation.

Applicant #21 was a returning applicant, L. Diaz asked if their attendance has improved since the last time they were reviewed. D. Law said they had 3 excused absences and 1 unexcused. M. Cappuccilli mentioned that virtual meetings were likely more accessible for them. L. Diaz agreed to approve them due to attendance increase. Everyone agreed.

Applicant #8 was a new applicant. M. Cappuccilli noted that #8 was an aligned consumer and approved for recommendation.

Applicant #7 was a new applicant; L. Diaz said this applicant works for a provider (Prevention Point) that has not been a part of the HIPC council and appreciated that they were trying to get more involved. D. Law added that #7 was a PrEP Navigator. Everyone approved #7 for recommendation.

Applicant #1 was a new applicant. M. Cappuccilli said this person had a strong application and L. Diaz followed up saying the area they live in represented a large HIV-positive population. D. Law reminded the group that for every 2 providers the council needs 1 consumer. The panel decided to approve #1 if they did not drop too low with unaligned consumer members.

Applicant #9 was a new applicant, L. Diaz said that this person attends meetings and allocations and that the council needs representation from the PA counties. Applicant #9 was approved for recommendation.

Applicant #15 was a reapplicant, L. Diaz said she scored them low due to an answer on the application. D. Law said they were a member during 2020 when meetings switched to virtual, only having one unexcused absence in May of 2020. Additionally, D. Law noticed that they had become more vocal in meetings. Applicant #15 approved for recommendation.

Applicant #2 was a new applicant and did not pass. D. Law said they weren't responding to emails and L. Diaz said she would put in #2 over #1 since they were from the same organization.

Applicant #10 was a new applicant, L. Diaz asked if there was already someone from this provider on the council. D. Law stated that she received an email saying she wanted to reapply. S. Moletteri responded that the idea was that this new applicant would effectively replace the individual on the council working for the same provider. L. Diaz stated that she scored low, because they did not meet demographic criteria, and could take space from an unaligned

consumer.

M. Cappuccilli and L. Diaz agreed to stop approving the rest of the applicants since they were now at their lower scores and none of them would be consumer members. Everyone agreed. M. Cappuccilli asked D. Law to tally the current representative numbers based on who was recommended so far today.

D. Law said the goal was 50% unaligned consumer members, but 33% was mandated. These numbers she previously stated included approval of applicant #1. M. Cappuccilli said out of 24 applicants, they recommended 18 and would follow up with 3 of those 18 for tax clearances. Mike noted that numbers might be low because it was harder to retain members in a virtual setting.

L. Diaz asked what the number of consumers vs. providers was at this point in time so they do not overlook potential consumers. D. Law stated that so far of the 10 consumer applications (26%), 7 (or 18%) are unaligned of new applicants taken into consideration. M. Cappuccilli stated that he spoke to S. Moletteri regarding a recruitment presentation for this fall where the focus is to get more consumers on the council.

**Motion:** L. Diaz motioned to recommend the 18 applicants for HIPC membership, S. Heaven seconded. **Motion passed:** 100% in favor. The members were approved for recommendation.

**Any Other Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:** M. Cappuccilli called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, S. Heaven seconded to adjourn the August 31, 2021 Nominations Committee meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 1:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Elijah Sumners, staff