COMMUNITY
HOUSING
INITIATIVES

TO: Executive Committee
Chair, Iowa Council Homelessness Executive Committee

FROM: Mariliegh Fisher, Housing Director
Community Housing Initiatives

DATE: May 21, 2015

RE: APPEAL OF SCORING OF TRANSITIONAL HOUSING RENEWAL APPLICATION

Per the notice from Amber Lewis on May 15 2015, I am appealing the outcome of the scoring of the Transitional Housing renewal application that was discussed at the Continuum of Care Committee on May 12, 2015, and approved at the Council meeting on May 15, 2015.

I have reviewed the renewal applications of several agencies and have noticed that the scoring seems to be inconsistent. I offer the following for consideration:

Question #4: This is a four (4) part question. The Lighthouse Transitional Living Program operated by Youth and Shelter Services received 7 from each of the reviewers for a total of 14 points. The reason given by their reviewers was because they had no beds dedicated for the chronically homeless. The reason given for the reduction of points by the reviewers of CHI's application was that there no dedicated beds for the chronically homeless. CHI received 4 points from each of the reviewers for a total of 8 points. This is a difference of 6 points between the two different teams that reviewed the applications. I am requesting that this question be reevaluated based on the comments from both review teams and that those 6 points be awarded. Their reason for the reduction of points is the same yet the scores are far apart.

Question #20: The question was as follows: **Review the information for your project listed in the spreadsheet, "2015 Iowa Balance of State CoC Competition. Did your project expend all funds? Please explain**. CHI lost points for not discussing how this might be remedied next year. As you can see, the question does not ask for an explanation of how this is going to be remedied. Both reviewers listed this as the reason that points were lost. I also noticed that the wording of the comments by both reviewers is identical yet the scores are different. This was a total of 11 points that were lost for not discussing something that wasn't part of the question. I am asking that this score be reviewed and reevaluated and those 11 points be awarded based on the response given to the question that is asked. The applications should not be scored on what someone perceives should be in the response.

915 West 4th Street, Waterloo, IA 50702
ph: 319.235.3000 | fx: 319.235.8022 | www.chihousing.com

NeighborWorks® CHARTERED MEMBER
United Way

I understand that this is a difficult process and by having two teams review the applications it can be hard to have consistent scoring. Perhaps this should be something that should be considered before the next application process.

I have attached the scoring sheets of the agencies that I have referred to in the above appeal. (Youth & Shelter Services, Inc. and CHI)

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to your response.