



Eastern PA CoC Board Meeting

Agenda

May 19, 2025

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/95780178070?pwd=emtjUy9lelByTndUdng3cGVZT29wQT09>

Meeting ID: 957 8017 8070

Passcode: 020931

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	PURPOSE
10:00 a.m.	Call to order-Alisa Baratta	
10:05 a.m.	Approval of April meeting minutes	Vote needed. Minutes are on page 12.
10:05 a.m.	Coordinated Entry Planning Discussion - Leslie Perryman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CE Manager Job Description CE Sub-Committee H4G update 	<i>New standing agenda Item</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please find the CE Manager Job description in the board packet on page 4.
10:35 am	Housing Innovations Training Update -Lauren Whitleigh	
10:40 a.m.	CoC Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New role for the former committee Forming a Marketing Committee Future Housing Policy Work 	<i>New standing agenda item</i> See the draft of the new committee role in the board packet on page 10.
10:55a.m.	Moving the Peer Collaborative Groups Forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who should schedule and facilitate meetings? 	Should DMA support for setting up meetings, Zoom links, calendar invites, etc.?
11:05 a.m.	Review of the Slate of CoC Board Candidates-Brendan and prepare for the vote.	Discuss and Vote on new board members. Slate of applicants on page 11.
11:35 a.m.	Break and adjourn to hold 501(c)3 meeting	See the agenda on page 2.
12:00 p.m.	If the 501(c)3 meeting ends and there is a need we will reconvene the CoC Board Meeting, we expect to adjourn again at 12:00 pm	

Eastern Pennsylvania Continuum of Care
Board Meeting Minutes
May 25, 2025
10:00-12:00

Attendance

Alisa Baratta
Leslie Perryman
Tiffany Jones
Carol Thornton

Stephanie Meyer
Donna Maglaviti
Nick Dennis
Ash Hersh

Dorese Tolson
Amanda Riehl
Mary Penny
George Payne

Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Alisa Baratta opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. The board began by reviewing the minutes from the April 2025 meeting. There were no changes requested.

Board Vote

- Motion to approve April meeting minutes passed unanimously.

Coordinated Entry (CE) Planning Discussion

Leslie Perryman led the discussion on Coordinated Entry (CE) Updates and directed board members to the Coordinated Entry Manager job description included in their packets and shared that the CE committee was recommending a title change from “Manager” to “Director” to avoid confusion with the existing “Regional Manager” title.

She explained that while they were not yet hiring for the position, they wanted to finalize the job description now so the system would be prepared when hiring begins. The job description was developed and submitted by the committee for board approval. Alisa asked if a salary range had been determined. Leslie said the salary had not been finalized, as it was dependent on information in the business plan and available funding allocations. The group agreed that reviewing the business plan was a necessary next step to finalizing salary details. Alisa asked for a second to approve the job description. Donna Manglaviti seconded, and the board unanimously approved the description and the new title of Coordinated Entry Director.

Board Vote

- The board unanimously approved the description and the new title of Coordinated Entry Director.

Leslie then moved into a broader discussion of Coordinated Entry system planning. She reminded the board that, during a previous meeting, it had been decided that a CE Subcommittee of the board would be formed to address the communication and coordination of CE-related grants and contracts. This group was also tasked with improving messaging to regional managers, contract holders, and United Way, especially in light of forthcoming structural changes related to the fiscal conduit.

However, this subcommittee had not yet met, and with Brendan out on leave, scheduling remained uncertain. Leslie noted that the changes they were planning were not scheduled to take effect until the end of the current 2026 contract period, so there was still time to move forward strategically. Alisa proposed that Amanda, authorized by the board to act for Brendan, could help schedule the subcommittee. Leslie agreed, and Amanda was invited to coordinate.

Leslie then provided a detailed update on the Home for Good grant, which funds housing problem-solving (HPS) efforts across the region. She explained that an RFP had been released in April and that 11 applications were received. Of those, 9 access sites were selected for funding. Approximately \$150,000 remains available and will be awarded through a second RFP round. This second round will feature targeted outreach to access sites that did not apply the first time, with some speculation that capacity and timing issues were likely barriers in the initial round.

Leslie further explained that if funding remains after this second round, the committee would consider offering additional funds to the originally selected awardees. She noted that applicants were evaluated on the size of their CE service footprint, their walk-in traffic, and the quality of their programmatic plans. For example, the Center for Community Action was awarded more than the \$50,000 cap because of the scale of their services and the number of CE intakes they conduct. Two applications were declined due to vague activity descriptions or very low intake numbers (e.g., five intakes over the past year).

As the discussion concluded, Leslie reported strong engagement from access sites and described the overall initiative as promising and aligned with the broader goals of CE and housing diversion.

Housing Retention Training Update

Mary Penny shared an update on the recent training provided by Housing Innovations focused on housing retention strategies. Mary reported that four initial training sessions were held, two focused on Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and two on Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), split between Bethlehem and Harrisburg. She noted the sessions were exceptionally well-received and described them as among the most positively reviewed trainings in recent memory. One participant who had previously expressed dissatisfaction with 2024's Housing First training even described the new sessions as informative, stating it helped reshape how they approached program management. Alisa asked whether the sessions reached most CoC grantees. Mary responded that participation was strong and widespread, with particularly large turnouts in Bethlehem. She also emphasized that recordings had been made available to those unable to attend. When asked about feedback from the trainers, Mary reported that the Housing Innovations team was very pleased with participant engagement. Tiffany Jones shared that her team found the training highly beneficial, particularly the case management components. She described it as productive trainings with meaningful discussion and strong back-and-forth dialogue.

CoC Committees

The group then transitioned into an update on CoC committee development, beginning with an update on the new “Community Engagement and Network Development Committee.” She described how the new committee would focus on welcoming new CoC members, onboarding new RAB and board members, and promoting storytelling and external communications. Other goals include providing feedback on events and presentations and identifying potential community leaders for future involvement. Mary acknowledged the need for a stronger welcoming process for new members and highlighted the opportunity to build leadership pipelines and deepen community representation. The proposal language has been updated to remove certain terminology and now focuses more broadly on CoC membership and engagement. Leslie asked if this committee would coordinate with the governance group, which is also working on membership issues. Mary explained that this new group would operate downstream of governance decisions, providing a “next step” for onboarding and community building after new members were approved.

Mary then shared a promising development: she recently met with the marketing lead from the United Way of Schuylkill County, who unexpectedly volunteered to help start a CoC marketing committee. The individual also offered to connect the CoC with a marketing professional from Mrs. T’s Pierogies, a nationally recognized brand headquartered locally. This PR team is reportedly interested in taking on some pro bono community-based projects, and they may support the CoC’s marketing efforts. Mary asked whether the board supported her moving forward with these opportunities and taking foundational steps to create a marketing workgroup or committee. The board took no formal vote but supported moving forward with this initiative.

Mary next revisited a prior discussion from December about the need for a CoC policy and advocacy committee. She suggested that with Phyllis Chamberlain from the Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania now up for board nomination, the CoC had a perfect opportunity to reinstate this work, leveraging her expertise and connections. Alisa added that Erin Conley, who was recently appointed as co-chair of the Lehigh Valley RAB, also brings a policy background through her role at United Way. These additions could help build a strong foundation for advocacy. Mary proposed the formation of a working group to begin exploring the CoC’s policy priorities and strategies. Carol Thornton raised a concern about proposed federal budget changes that could drastically alter CoC funding. She shared that the President’s budget proposal includes eliminating dedicated funding for Coordinated Entry and shifting it to ESG block grants managed by states. Both Carol and Leslie highlighted the risk this posed not just to CE but to the entire CoC model, including planning grants.

Alisa emphasized the need for urgency in addressing this issue and offered to help convene this policy-focused ad hoc group. Carol, Mary, Leslie, and Stephanie volunteered to support it, with Mary to coordinate meetings. The group agreed that this immediate advocacy need would be handled by the ad hoc group rather than a full committee.

Peer Collaborative Groups

The board then moves to the agenda item of peer collaborative groups launched during last year’s membership meeting. These groups received positive feedback, and participants expressed strong interest in continuing their work. Mary noted that while the groups were designed to be peer-led, two of them had requested light support, primarily around logistics, such as Zoom scheduling and communication. Leslie, speaking on behalf of the PSH group, clarified that they were comfortable facilitating their discussions but needed help organizing meetings and communicating between sessions. Tiffany Jones agreed, noting that scheduling and burnout had hindered participation

despite strong initial interest. She emphasized the importance of keeping these collaborative spaces alive.

Carol Thornton recommended documenting each group's purpose and scope to reduce confusion and improve engagement. Alisa Baratta emphasized the original intent of the groups as vehicles for collaboration and innovation. She supported the plan to provide infrastructure support without disrupting peer leadership. Mary asked the board for approval for DMA to provide light administrative support to help the groups sustain momentum. There were no objections, and the discussion affirmed that DMA's role should be supportive, not directive, with a long-term goal of having fully peer-led groups. A formal vote was not taken.

Action Items

- DMA to manage scheduling and tech support for Peer Collaborative Groups until groups no longer require support.
- Focus on Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter First and use the Communities of Practice training as a jumping off point to continue with the Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Rehousing groups.
- Summary of group status to be shared with the board

Review of Board Slate and Vote

Alisa turned to review the proposed slate of new board members recommended by the Governance Committee. The slate was developed from a pool of approximately 18 applicants.

Amanda Riehl introduced the item in Brendan Auman's absence. She clarified that while she did not participate in selecting candidates, the Governance Committee had reviewed applications and developed the proposed slate. Amada provided a detailed spreadsheet outlining each candidate's qualifications, experience, and affiliations, which was shared in advance along with the board packet.

The slate included:

- Two RHAB Representatives: Donna Maglaviti and Erin Conley
- Statewide and regional representatives

Alisa clarified that the board was being asked to vote on the entire slate rather than individual candidates. Amanda affirmed this process. Because the recommendation came from a board committee, it required only a second to move forward with a vote.

Donna Maglaviti, newly appointed to the Governance Committee, expressed that, in retrospect, the committee may not have sufficiently considered board term staggering or open slots. She noted that the current slate left two board seats unfilled and used only 1- and 3-year terms, which could disrupt board rotation. Alisa responded that the governance charter allows only 1- or 3-year terms at present, and any change to that structure would require a policy revision. Dorese Tolson asked how many applications were received (18) and why only eight individuals were included on the final slate. Leslie Perryman explained that while the board could hold up to 18 members, seating all open positions at once would risk a large cohort rotating off simultaneously. The committee favored staggering appointments to ensure continuity and preserve institutional knowledge.

Dorese then raised a central issue: Were any individuals with lived experience of homelessness included on the slate? Mary confirmed that none of the individuals selected had disclosed lived experience, but other applicants had. This prompted significant discussion. Board members questioned why a qualified candidate with lived experience was excluded, especially given the board's commitment to elevating those voices.

Leslie emphasized that the committee had worked to avoid regional imbalance, but acknowledged the need to revisit how lived experience was weighted.

Alisa proposed a procedural option: hold a vote on the slate as presented, with members free to vote “no” if they felt it should be returned for revision.

A roll call vote was conducted. All voting members present voted to return the slate to the Governance Committee for further review.

Next Steps

- Leslie Perryman recommended that the Governance Committee identify whether each candidate is an RHAB member, regional stakeholder, or statewide appointee.
- Mary Penny agreed to share the full list of original applicants with the board for transparency.
- Alisa Baratta asked any board members with recommendations or concerns to email them to Mary, who would compile feedback for the committee.
- The timeline was noted as critical. The revised slate must be finalized and returned to the board within a few days to seat members by the July 1 start date.

Alisa clarified that Donna Maglaviti and Erin Conley, as RAB-elected representatives, were already approved and would remain on the final slate regardless of revisions.

In closing, Alisa reiterated the board’s responsibility to uphold regional equity and ensure meaningful representation of lived experience in all board appointments.

Board Vote

- The board voted unanimously to return the slate of applicants to the Governance Committee for reconsideration.

With no further business, Alisa Baratta requested a motion to adjourn the CoC Board Meeting.

Board Vote

- The motion passed unanimously

The CoC Board Meeting adjourned. The 501(c)(3) meeting was convened immediately afterward. **