

# MEETING AGENDA

*VIRTUAL:*

*Thursday, March 10, 2022*

*12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.*

- Call to Order
- Welcome/Introductions
- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes (*February 10, 2022*)
- Report of Co-Chairs
- Report of Staff
- Discussion Items
  - Reminder Letter Template
  - Buddy System Guidelines
- 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. 12<sup>TH</sup> Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • [www.hivphilly.org](http://www.hivphilly.org)

**Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Nominations Committee  
Meeting Minutes of  
Thursday, February 10, 2022  
12:00-1:45 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Juan Baez, Mike Cappuccilli (Co-chair), Lupe Diaz, Julie Hazzard,  
Sharee Heaven, Shane Nieves, Sam Romero

**Staff:** Debbie Law, Julia Henrikson, Sofia Moletteri, Beth Celeste, Elijah  
Summers

**Call to Order:** M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 1:06pm

**Approval of Agenda:** J. Baez presented the February agenda for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, L. Diaz seconded to approve the February 2022 Agenda with additions to the agenda **Motion passed:** 5 in favor, 1 abstained.

**Approval of Minutes** (*January 13, 2022*): J. Baez presented the previous meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, J. Hazzard seconded to approve the January 2022 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 4 in favor, 1 abstained.

**Report of Co-Chair:**

None.

**Report of Staff:**

S. Moletteri reported that the Recruitment Guidelines would not be voted on during the HIPC meeting because of the Project Officer comments.

**Discussion Items:**

***--Membership Attendance Letters--***

D. Law reported that she sent out attendance warning letters to those members who were identified as having attendance issues. M. Cappuccilli asked to go through those who responded to the attendance letters. One member responded that he was still interested in participating in the Planning Council, but had personal problems that prohibited his involvement. D. Law stated that she emailed another member twice and received a response that she wanted to finish her term that ended in March. J. Baez stated that people who

were employed by an agency probably felt that their involvement in the Planning Council was contingent on their employment with said organization.

D. Law shared another member's detailed response and M. Cappuccilli mentioned that this member represented NJ. J. Baez stated that this member was entitled to their experience and that speaking on sensitive issues could have made them uncomfortable; however, the Nominations Committee was only asking for information that would have prohibited their full participation in the Council. M. Cappuccilli agreed with J. Baez said that he felt as though the Council was respectful to those who were questioned about their attendance, and questioned how they could be better moving forward.

S. Nieves asked when we're reaching out to people about missed meetings, were we sending out an email to them as well? D. Law explained that the attendance policy was that if you have three unexcused absences in a row, and you don't tell OHP staff why you're to be excused, or five total absences with excused or unexcused absences in a 12-month period, you will be removed. That is the language in the bylaws. When the Nominations Committee reviewed the attendance, it looked at the past 12 months, or the most relevant data for the person, and total the number of absences to determine if they were excused or unexcused. Sometimes members share with us why they missed a meeting, whether it's illness, or job related. We talk about each member that's in violation of this attendance policy. We go over each one of them, and we decide what action we want to take. If we know them personally, members of the nominations committee could contact them.

M. Cappuccilli stated that the members of the Nominations Committee make a point of asking people if there was a barrier to their participation and how we could help with that. D. Law reiterated once members were contacted they were at a point where they were already in violation and at that point, they could be removed, but the Nominations Committee chooses not to do that, rather they reach out to them. J. Hazzard asked if it was possible to reach out prior to the three missed meetings? D. Law responded that when meetings were in-person she would ask people but now that it was virtual that changed the ease in which those simple conversations could happen because it was now based on the attendance data.

M. Cappuccilli stated that as we go forward, as the role of Nominations becomes less about recruitment and more about retention, we could rethink how muscular we make our efforts to keep people in the process, and maybe more frequent calls. L. Diaz reminded the committee that that suggestion would mean going through the attendance every month or every other month rather than every 5 months as previously established. M. Cappuccilli asked if it was worth discussing with the Planning Council about medical leave of absence that people may not know was an available option during times of personal challenges. S. Heaven responded that there was no problem with reiterating the policy, but people needed to advocate for themselves.

L. Diaz suggested that as Co-Chairs of HIPC she or S. Heaven could make an

announcement at the beginning of the meeting to state the attendance policy as a way to put it in the forefront of member's minds. J. Baez responded that he believed that was a good idea as well as adding it to meeting reminder emails.

M. Cappuccilli asked instead of calling it a warning letter, can we call these reminder letters? D. Law responded that she called them "warning letters" because that was the phrase she was used to, but when she sent them to members with attendance problems she addressed them as "friendly reminders." M. Cappuccilli asked if D. Law could send those present a template of the letter she sent to those with attendance violations ahead of next month's meeting.

***–Orientation–***

D. Law reported that 6 of the 9 new members attended the orientation, it was very detailed and new members were very engaged. Members represented all three regions, and she would reach out to the new members who were not in attendance. There were more detailed questions than usual, but overall, it was informative for them and they already were showing interest in different subcommittees.

M. Cappuccilli asked did they get introduced and acknowledged in meetings? D. Law stated that in-person meetings usually allowed them the opportunity to do so but given we were still meeting virtually it was not discussed further how it would be approached.

***–Retention–***

M. Cappuccilli asked the committee if we should put more emphasis on retention than we already do? For example, he said the "buddy system" could stand to help mentor new members of the Planning Council, and he asked should we be reaching out to them more proactively? S. Moletteri suggested that it would be beneficial during orientation for buddies to be assigned and then go into breakout rooms with your buddy, so you can have that introduction and build rapport from the onset. J. Hazard agreed that it was a nice idea as HIPC was still meeting virtually.

M. Cappuccilli suggested that the Nominations Committee be a bigger part of orientation activities and act as the first set of "buddies" in this system. S. heaven agreed and stated that Nominations could best discuss how they want to broach the topic in another meeting. S. Romero suggested that the buddy system not be limited to just the Nominations Committee because there were fewer members than other subcommittees and opening it up to more members would benefit new and older members.

J. Baez suggested talking about a strategy for where we first get people in the door, but there should also be a check-in with members somewhere down the line, perhaps in the middle of their membership. M. Cappuccilli agreed and stated that was what a lot of other EMAs do. D. Law responded that we can have a more detailed talk about this

about the buddy system because when we open it up to other members, we need some standardization of expectations and boundaries. M. Cappuccilli suggested that it be put on the next month's agenda.

J. Baez pushed back on the buddy system stating that it was additional work that he could not commit to at this time. He suggested that meeting periodically throughout the year of someone's membership could suffice if done effectively. L. Diaz also stated that it needed to be very structured because the past buddy system was not good for her personally.

**Any Other Business:**

D. Law stated that there were members whose terms were ending this spring, last time their membership was extended to the fall. This time there were two members terms ending and there were currently no new applicants, and she asked if it was possible to extend one person's term to the fall so they could coincide with other folks. L. Diaz said she was not opposed but the last time something like this happened and there was a vote to extend them there was a wait for the Mayor's Office to confirm it. D. Law responded that the Nominations Committee could make that recommendation like the last time, but that M. Ross-Russell stated that the last time OHP didn't receive the letters or extension letters in a timely fashion.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:** L. Diaz called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** J. Baez motioned, S. Romero seconded to adjourn the February 10, 2022 Nominations Committee meeting.  
**Motion passed:** All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Elijah Sumners, staff