



TO: Iowa Council on Homeless Executive Committee

FROM: Mariliegh Fisher, Supportive Housing Director *Mariliegh Fisher*
Community Housing Initiatives, Inc.

DATE: July 21, 2016

RE: APPEAL OF SCORING AND RANKING OF THE PERMANENT
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING RENEWAL APPLICATION

I am asking the Executive Committee to rescore and re-rank the Permanent Supportive Housing renewal grant submitted by Community Housing Initiatives for the following reasons:

On #18 on the renewal application three of the grant reviewers gave the score of 16 out of 16. The fourth reviewer gave the score of 15 out 16 giving the comment that I did not list the money that was not spent. This question was answered earlier in the application and I lost points for it. The chart in #18 does not ask for any explanation of unspent funds. The other reviewers did not take away points for not including this information in the answer. I would ask that the Executive Committee award the one (1) point that was deducted for the answer.

On question #16, one of the questions asked was whether or not the agency had a person who had completed SOAR training. On the applications that were submitted, 9 agencies responded that they had a person who had completed SOAR training. As you can see from the list (SOAR) that I have attached, of the agencies that are funded through the CoC, there are only 4 agencies (that I can see) that actually have a staff person who has completed the training. The SOAR training is a very time consuming process and my Case Manager worked very hard to get the training completed before the application deadline so we wouldn't lose points. By not checking to see if the agency responded correctly basically tells those applying that they don't have to worry about being honest because there are no consequences if they are not. If points would have actually been deducted for not having a staff person that has been SOAR trained, CHI would rank higher than Humility of Mary Shelter (Collaboration) and the YWCA of Clinton on the ranking chart for the renewal applications.

I know that this appeal may seem petty to some people. I do appreciate the volunteers that took time to review the applications and do the scoring. However, it would seem this issue could have been avoided if the agencies would have had to attach proof that the training had been completed. People who reviewed the applications had no way of knowing if the question was answered correctly. If it is HUD's intent to have more individuals SOAR trained, I believe that this will stall the number of those completing the training. They have no reason to complete it until the next renewal application is due.

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