


**BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



**City Hall**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco 94102-4689**  
**Tel. No. 554-5184**  
**Fax No. 554-5163**  
**TDD/TTY No. 554-5227**

DATE: August 3, 2017  
TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors  
FROM:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Civil Grand Jury Report "Accelerating SF Government Performance"

We are in receipt of the following required responses to the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report released June 5, 2017, entitled: "Accelerating SF Government Performance." Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the City Departments shall respond to the report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than July 30, 2017.

For each finding the Department response shall:

- 1) agree with the finding; or
- 2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the Department shall report that:

- 1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
- 2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
- 3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
- 4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

The Civil Grand Jury Report identified the following City Departments to submit responses (attached):

- Office of the Controller:  
Received July 28, 2017, for Findings 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8; and Recommendations 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 5, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8; and
- Office of the Mayor:  
Received August 3, 2017, for Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7; and Recommendations 1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 6, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4.

These departmental responses are being provided for your information, as received, and may not conform to the parameters stated in California Penal Code, Section 933.05 et seq. The Government Audit and Oversight Committee will consider the subject report, along with the responses, at an upcoming hearing and will prepare the Board's official response by Resolution for the full Board's consideration.

c:

Honorable Teri L. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Kathie Lowry, 2016-2017 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury  
Kitsaun King, 2016-2017 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury  
Kate Howard, Mayor's Office  
Marie Valdez, Mayor's Office  
Ben Rosenfield, Controller, Office of the Controller  
Asja Steeves, Office of the Controller  
Peg Stevenson, Office of the Controller  
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney  
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director  
Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst  
Ashley Clark, Budget and Legislative Analyst



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
**OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER**

**Ben Rosenfield**  
**Controller**

**Todd Rydstrom**  
**Deputy Controller**

July 28, 2017

The Honorable Teri L. Jackson  
Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco  
400 McAllister Street, Room 008  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, this memo and the attached table are in reply to the 2016-17 Civil Grand Jury report, *Accelerating SF Government Performance*. We would like to thank the Civil Grand Jury for their thoughtful review of the City's performance efforts. In particular, we very much appreciate the review of the Performance Scorecards—this feedback is valuable since the Scorecards publication and website format is a relatively new product for the Controller's Office in its performance portfolio.

The Controller's Office has been engaged in performance reporting and measurement citywide since the 1990s. We have worked steadily to improve the breadth and quality of performance measurement, train City staff in how to do it well, and publish performance information for the public and City leadership. The City Services Auditor charter amendment passed in November 2003 raised our level of work with new mandates and resources in this area. Since then, the Controller's Office has grown the public information part of the program to now include a citywide database of over 1,000 tracked measures, the Performance Scorecards with approximately 90 measures in an interactive public website, and departmental and citywide benchmarking reports. Our training and technical assistance program includes ongoing work with departments to improve their measurement and management, a Data Academy teaching data analysis and visualization skills and software to City staff, "Stat" programs, and dashboard development. The Mayor's Office has been a reliable partner in these efforts and in FY2016 and FY2017 worked diligently with us on the Performance Scorecards product as well as in other program areas.

The Civil Grand Jury's report and its focus on the Performance Scorecard framework provided important findings and recommendations. We will use this feedback to improve our efforts and seek to make the website and information better known by the public and in the media.

If you have any questions about this response, please contact Performance Director Peg Stevenson or me at 415-554-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ben Rosenfield  
Controller

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City and County of San Francisco

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
Controller's Office Responses

| #  | Findings  | 2017 Responses<br>(Agree/Disagree)                       | 2017 Response Text  |
|----|---|--|---|
| F2 | Despite the Mayor's role as the accountable executive of the SFG, the Mayor does not directly report performance results to the public, as is done in other leading cities. | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | The Mayor's Office does performance reporting to the public in the Mayor's Budget Book, DataSF, and in many other ways. The Mayor's Office works as a partner with the Controller's Office in the development of the citywide performance reporting products that our office creates and maintains; they work with us in the development of the Performance Scorecards, and the content of the larger Performance Measurement Database. Organizationally there is value to having the core public reporting function in the Controller's Office. It is our job to provide neutral non-political measurement and reporting as is contemplated in Charter Appendix F. The Controller's Office can carry out stable, long-term development and maintenance of performance reporting in a way that an office more directly affected by election cycles cannot.  |
| F3 | The PS framework encompasses too many indicators – some of the indicators are of great importance, whereas others are much less significant.                                | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | The Performance Scorecard project - focusing on fewer than 100 key performance metrics - is partially in response to the general observation that both current and past grand juries have made, and that the Controller's Office concurs with - that too many measures in publically-facing reporting can make it difficult for policy makers or the public to understand what to focus on and what is truly important. The scorecards measures have been selected through a process that involves review of over 1,000 measures tracked and reported through our performance measurement program. However, San Francisco is a uniquely consolidated government, combining city, county, and many regional functions that in most other places are stand-alone governmental entities. Given this broad scope of services, the Performance Scorecards should report on performance across a larger number of services than the examples provided in the CGJ report. While some indicators are of great importance, some are included to provide educational information to the public and policymakers about the essential functions of government. We regularly review the relevance and importance of this new performance reporting tool and will continue to refine the selection and quantity of performance measures highlighted on the Performance Scorecards website, to eliminate less valuable indicators, while developing those of greater importance. |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
Controller's Office Responses

| #  | Findings   | 2017 Responses<br>(Agree/Disagree)                       | 2017 Response Text   |
|----|--|--|--|
| F4 | Having performance indicators without associated goals goes against practice in other leading cities, and limits the public's ability to understand how the SFG is progressing.  | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | We concur that performance measures are most meaningful if goals, targets, or projections are established as a benchmark against which to evaluate actual results. The majority of scorecard indicators report and track results against a target established through the City's budget process. In limited instances, policymakers have not yet identified a goal for a given measure which we have begun tracking using this tool; we expect continued improvement in this area in coming cycles as this new performance tracking tool becomes more broadly utilized, and have added targets for measures formally without them in the prior year during this year's cycle. However, in other limited circumstances, we have chosen to track high public interest measures in the scorecard format where goals are not likely to be established in the nearer term, or where to do so would not be practical, such as for certain economic or demographic information. |
| F5 | Citizens have almost no means by which to regularly and systematically assess the SFG's performance relative to other leading cities; in contrast, other leading cities provide this information to their citizens.  | disagree with it, wholly (explanation in next column)    | The Controller's Office publishes performance benchmarking reports, including a new FY17 Citywide Annual Benchmarking report, comparing San Francisco to similar jurisdictions across seven policy areas. This report is very broad and methodologically rigorous and is a best in class example of government benchmarking data. One of the two examples provided in the CGJ report as a best practice for comparison reporting is the national index for major road quality. As mentioned previously, this dataset is misleading in the quality of San Francisco's streets as it combines reporting with Oakland and highways managed by the State, both of which have lower results in road quality. We were unable to find results of the other example mentioned regarding the Austin performance reporting.  |
| F7 | The specific indicators used within the SFG's PS framework to track performance in the areas of the gravest public concern should be updated to better reflect what the SFG is doing to address the public's gravest concerns.   | agree with finding                                       | We regularly evaluate the relevance of performance measures included in the Performance Scorecard website. As this is a new tool, we are still collecting ideas and input in how to best refine what is included and have made changes by adding or revising measures as better performance reporting is identified. Several new measures have been added or are in development for the new fiscal year -- including transit ridership, housing production, and new measures for homeless services in the City -- while other measures of more limited importance have been eliminated. Continued feedback on measure selection from the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, department leadership, and CGOBOC will assist in this ongoing process.  |
| F8 | Noting the severe economic inequality within and between various neighborhoods and communities in the City, and consistent with the City's long-standing reputation for socially inclusive policies, the PS framework should more directly gauge SFG progress in addressing social, gender | agree with finding                                       | Our original direction with the Performance Scorecards has been to show the level and effectiveness of public services of SF as is mandated under Charter Appendix F. We agree that the City has policy goals directed at addressing social, gender and racial equity and will work to include measures of these issues in future development efforts. We will work to include new measures with these goals in mind in the coming fiscal year.  |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance: **Controller's Office Responses**

| #    | Recommendations  | 2017 Responses (implementation)   | 2017 Response Text   |
|------|--|---|--|
| R2.1 | <p>Consistent with other leading cities, beginning in 2018 the Mayor should present an annual SFG Performance report that concisely communicates SFG performance and progress to the public; the public transmission of which should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Hosting a public press conference, the first of which would occur not later than January 31, 2019, announcing the SFG's annual performance.</li> <li>ii. Posting the SFG Performance report, not later than January 31, 2019, on the Office of the Mayor's website homepage.</li> <li>iii. Submitting the SFG Performance report to the Board of Supervisors for comment.</li> <li>iv. Within 30 days of the Board of Supervisors response, the Controller's Office should update the PS website to reflect annual SFG performance, with comments from the Board of Supervisors and responses from the Office of the Mayor included online for the public's reference.</li> </ul> | <p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation in next column)</p>            | <p>This recommendation should be directed to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, and not to the Controller's Office. The Controller's Office will continue to develop and maintain citywide performance reporting in our program as mandated under the Charter. We also want to support accountability, public reporting and performance management desired and requested by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, in their roles as elected policymakers responsible for overall governmental performance. We will work with them to publish materials and provide information for public hearings, in the form and process that they establish to promote transparency and accountability.</p>   |
| R2.2 | <p>Commencing in 2018, the Controller's Office should prepare quarterly updates of the PS framework, inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Submission of the quarterly update to the Board of Supervisor's GAO Committee and the Office of the Mayor, inviting comment.</li> <li>ii. Posting the quarterly update on the PS website homepage, with comments from the Board of Supervisors and Office of the Mayor included for public reference.</li> </ul>  | <p>The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)</p> | <p>Many of the governmental performance reporting mechanisms we have reviewed in other jurisdictions are annual or semi-annual in nature. A key benefit of the Performance Scorecard format is the regular updates to key performance information on a more frequent schedule, with the majority of measures updated either monthly or quarterly, for more real-time monitoring by interested parties. We concur, however, that periodic static reporting on trends is always valuable, and have produced an annual report summarizing trends over the year and overall progress towards adopted goals. As a means to enhance public access to this information, we will plan to prepare a mid-year report on trends and progress for scorecard measures, and will assess the relative benefit of shifting to a quarterly schedule following that change.</p>  |
| R3.1 | <p>In consultation with other SFG entities and community groups, the Office of the Controller should propose a narrowed set of PS indicators, likely not exceeding 30 total, by October 1, 2017; the Board of Supervisor's GAO Committee should be invited to comment on the revised indicators prior to submission to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.</p>  | <p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation in next column)</p>            | <p>The Performance Scorecard project - focusing on fewer than 90 key performance metrics - is partially in response to the general observation that both current and past Grand Juries have made, and that the Controller's Office concurs with - that too many measures in publicly-facing reporting can make it difficult for policy makers or the public to understand what to focus on and what is truly important. The scorecards measures have been selected through a process that involves review of over 1,000 measures tracked and reported through our performance measurement program. However, San Francisco is a uniquely consolidated government, combining city, county, and many regional functions that in most other places are stand-alone governmental entities. Given this broad scope of services, the Performance Scorecards should report on performance across a larger number of services than the examples from other jurisdictions provided in the CGJ report. While some indicators are of great importance, some are included to provide educational information to the public and policymakers about the essential functions of government. We regularly review the relevance and importance of this new performance reporting tool and will continue to refine the selection and quantity of performance measures highlighted on the Performance Scorecards website, to eliminate less valuable indicators, while developing those of greater importance. We continue to seek and welcome input on the specific Performance Scorecard measures from the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, and others, and will continue to solicit feedback on both appropriate scorecard measurements and goals.</p> |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance: **Controller's Office Responses**

| #    | Recommendations   | 2017 Responses (implementation)   | 2017 Response Text   |
|------|---|---|--|
| R3.2 | In consultation with other SFG entities and community groups, the Controller's Office should evaluate, no later than July 1, 2018, the feasibility of including district level reporting on some or all indicators and posting this information within the online PS platform, enabling citizens to understand progress in their neighborhoods. | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)  | There is some geographic reporting available in the a limited number of the scorecard measures, and links to other geospatial analyses we perform are embedded within the measure pages. We concur that the inclusion of additional geographic variance reporting for key measures will add value to the site, and will explore feasibility of expanding such reporting in the coming fiscal year, as recommended.   |
| R4.2 | The Controller's Office should ensure that by January 1, 2018 the PS framework includes comparative performance figures against prior year goals alongside the current year goal and progress, so citizens can understand the trend of SFG progress.  | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)  | The addition of trend data and indicators are features for the site which are under development. We intend to complete this work in the year ahead.  |
| R5   | The Controller's Office should identify the top 3-5 rankings/indices relevant to each scorecard, and add these to the PS framework by January 1, 2018.  | The recommendation requires further analysis (explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for discussion, not more than six months from the release of the report noted in next column) | Concurrent with the development of the Performance Scorecard program, we have revised our approach to annual benchmark reporting, and now have a broad and comprehensive benchmarking report that, for key measures such as street conditions, includes review of scorecard measures versus other jurisdictions. We anticipate increasing the linkages between these two related projects, where possible and valuable, and will continue to do so in the coming fiscal year and beyond. The specific use of 3-5 jurisdictional comparisons and completion by the specific date recommended are not feasible or advisable, from our perspective.                           |
| R7.1 | The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current housing affordability indicators based on recommendations from the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and submit the revisions to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.   | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)  | Our office concurs that improved housing production and affordability measures are needed, and has been working with appropriate departments to develop them. We intend to complete this work on the recommended timeline.   |
| R7.2 | The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current homelessness indicators based on recommendations from the DSHS Director and the examples of other leading cities, and submit the revised indicators to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.  | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)  | Our office concurs that these measures should be augmented. Some operating indicators may become reliable in this timeframe and if so we will develop and publish those data. For client data, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is underway with a new case tracking system that will allow for reporting on client numbers and outcomes. Working with them we may be able to define and propose new measures by January 2018, however reliable data from the system will not be available until FY 2018-19.  |
| R7.3 | The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current crime/street safety indicators based on recommendations from the Chief of Police and the examples of other leading cities, and submit the revised indicators to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.   | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation in next column)   | The current public safety measures were chosen in consultation with the Police Department, the Department of Emergency Management and the Mayor's Office when the Performance Scorecards were developed. Uniform Crime Measures for property and violent crime, and the various 911 response measures, are indicators used in every leading city. We have recently added measures of public opinion, including how safe people feel in their neighborhoods during the day and night. Should the SFPD, new chief or Mayor's Office want to update these measures we will work with them but we don't agree that changes in this group of measures is required at this time. |
| R8   | In consultation with other SFG entities and community organizations, the Controller's Office should ensure that, by January 1, 2018, one or more PS indicators are amended or added to ensure the SFG is tracking and reporting on the equitable distribution of government spending and services.  | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)  | We agree that the City has policy goals direct at addressing social, gender and racial equity and will work to include measures of these issues in future development efforts and on the recommended timeline.   |

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE  
MAYOR

August 3, 2017

The Honorable Teri L. Jackson  
Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco  
400 McAllister Street, Room 008  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is in reply to the 2016-17 Civil Grand Jury report, *Accelerating SF Government Performance*. We would like to thank the members of the Civil Grand Jury for their interest in the City's performance reporting activities and their efforts to improve the use of performance measurement in San Francisco.

Performance measurement and reporting has been an important practice within the City and County of San Francisco for many years. In November 2003, the voters of San Francisco passed Proposition C, which mandated the Controller's Office to monitor the level and effectiveness of services provided by the City and County of San Francisco. Since then, the Mayor's Office has worked closely with the Controller's Office to collect, measure, and report performance information on over 1,000 performance measures, covering all City departments and a wide variety of city programs and services.

In January 2016, the Mayor's Office and the Controller's Office collaborated to publish the San Francisco City Performance Scorecard website. This website features a more focused set of performance measures across eight major policy areas that are intended to inform the public and policymakers about the overall performance and viability of critical city services and indicators. These performance measures are updated frequently, and demonstrate progress toward stated goals and targets using red, yellow, and green indicators.

The Civil Grand Jury's report focused primarily on the Performance Scorecard framework, and provided a number of important findings and recommendations for how the website can be better utilized by the public and better integrated into other citywide planning. Since performance measurement has been part of the fabric of San Francisco for many years, the Mayor's Office will continue to work towards improving the use and reporting of performance information, and many of the recommendations presented in this report will be taken into consideration in Citywide planning efforts.

**A detailed response from the Mayor's Office to the Civil Grand Jury's findings and recommendations are attached.**

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this Civil Grand Jury report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Edwin Lee".

Edwin Lee  
Mayor



2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
Mayor's Office Responses

| #  | Findings   | 2017 Responses<br>(Agree/Disagree)                       | 2017 Response Text  |
|----|--|--|---|
| F1 | The broader public is barely aware of the performance scorecard (PS) framework, diminishing its utility and hampering the ability of San Francisco's Government (SFG) to communicate progress to San Franciscans.                      | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | The City has maintained a robust performance measurement system for almost two decades, and finding the right medium and right mix of measures is always a priority. The Mayor's Office has been engaged in a number of efforts to publicize the City's constantly improving performance measurement systems. The Scorecard website is a relatively new framework, launched in January 2016. The Mayor's Office updated its home page to include a direct link to the Scorecard website. Additionally, the local media closely follows the performance reporting done by the City, and frequently publishes articles based on performance reports issued by the City. The Mayor's Office will continue to publish performance information, including, but not limited to, the Scorecard website to the public. Broad public awareness is always the goal. |
| F2 | Despite the Mayor's role as the accountable executive of the SFG, the Mayor does not directly report performance results to the public, as is done in other leading cities.  | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | The Mayor's Office participates in performance reporting in a number of ways. The Mayor's Budget Book published each June includes a series of performance measures for each department with data on past performance, projected performance, and target performance. The Mayor's Office also works closely with the Controller's Office to support the Performance Measurement Database, and the Controller's Office publishes an annual report with all of the City's performance measures. Lastly, the Scorecards website, which publishes up-to-date performance information online, was developed and is maintained in collaboration with the Controller's Office.   |
| F3 | The PS framework encompasses too many indicators – some of the indicators are of great importance, whereas others are much less significant.   | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | The City currently tracks semi-annual performance data for over 1,000 measures. The Performance Scorecard website was developed to focus on a more limited set of measures that are the most relevant to the public and policymakers. While the website features a more limited set of measures, an important feature of the Scorecard website is that it presents a multi-dimensional picture of City services and the overall health and viability of the San Francisco as a City and government.   |
| F4 | Having performance indicators without associated goals goes against practice in other leading cities, and limits the public's ability to understand how the SFG is progressing.  | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | While the Scorecards website endeavors to have an associated goal for all measures, some measures lend themselves to tracking for the purpose of understanding trends. Performance trends can demonstrate important and useful information for observing performance over time. For example, by looking at performance trends, we can see that the numbers of active probationers or the population juvenile hall in San Francisco are decreasing, which speaks to the policies and practices that the City has put in to place better than measuring against a target population number. However, the Mayor's Office agrees that most measures should have an established target or benchmark to measure against, and will continue to work with departments to determine that best target or benchmark for each measure, where appropriate.             |
| F6 | The PS framework is not formally integrated into the SFG's planning process other than occasional budget discussions, whereas its true value is the extent to which SFG planning and budgeting is directly linked to the PS framework. | disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column) | As part of the budget development process, the Mayor's Budget Office carefully reviews a number of departmental performance measures, including, but not limited to, the measures that appear on the Scorecards website. These measures, including the Performance Scorecard measures, are published in the annual Mayor's Budget Book, and reported regularly on the Mayor's website. However, the Mayor's Office agrees that there are additional, important steps that can be taken to further integrate performance measures into City planning.  |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
 Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
 Mayor's Office Responses

| #  | Findings  | 2017 Responses<br>(Agree/Disagree)                              | 2017 Response Text  |
|----|---|---|---|
| F7 | <p>The specific indicators used within the SFG's PS framework to track performance in the areas of the gravest public concern should be updated to better reflect what the SFG is doing to address the public's gravest concerns.</p> | <p>disagree with it, partially (explanation in next column)</p> | <p>The Mayor's Office agrees that indicators should reflect those measures that are of concern to the public and policymakers. However, the Performance Scorecard website should also reflect performance against charter-mandated levels of services, or industry best practices. Limiting the Performance Scorecard website to only those measures that are of gravest public concern would limit reporting, and would leave out performance reporting that has been mandated by the voters or others. The Mayor's Office will continue to work with the Controller's Office to ensure that the Performance Scorecard website includes updated performance measures that best reflect the priorities of the City.</p> |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
 Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
 Mayor's Office Responses

| #    | Recommendations  | 2017 Responses (implementation)   | 2017 Response Text  |
|------|--|---|---|
| R1   | <p>In order to ensure broader public access to the PS platform, and consistent with the practice of other leading cities, a clear link to the PS website should be placed on the SFG website homepage, the Office of the Mayor's homepage and the Board of Supervisor's homepage by January 1, 2018.</p>   | <p>The recommendation has been implemented (summary of how it was implemented in next column)</p>                                   | <p>A direct link to the Scorecard website is linked to the homepage of the Mayor's website (sfmayor.org) as well the Controller's website (<a href="http://sfgov.org/scorecards/">http://sfgov.org/scorecards/</a>)</p>   |
| R2.1 | <p>Consistent with other leading cities, beginning in 2018 the Mayor should present an annual SFG Performance report that concisely communicates SFG performance and progress to the public; the public transmission of which should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Hosting a public press conference, the first of which would occur not later than January 31, 2019, announcing the SFG's annual performance.</li> <li>ii. Posting the SFG Performance report, not later than January 31, 2019, on the Office of the Mayor's website homepage.</li> <li>iii. Submitting the SFG Performance report to the Board of Supervisors for comment.</li> <li>iv. Within 30 days of the Board of Supervisors response, the Controller's Office should update the PS website to reflect annual SFG performance, with comments from the Board of Supervisors and responses from the Office of the Mayor included online for the public's reference.</li> </ul> | <p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation in next column)</p>            | <p>The Mayor's Office has taken a number of steps to communicate performance results to the public. The Mayor's Office proactively publishes performance information by directly linking to the Performance Scorecard website on the Mayor's homepage. It is important to note that the City Charter gives the Controller authority to collect, manage, and report performance information. The Controller is mandated to report on performance information, and will continue to do annual reporting. However, the Mayor's Office will continue to augment reporting efforts, as appropriate.</p>                        |
| R2.2 | <p>Commencing in 2018, the Controller's Office should prepare quarterly updates of the PS framework, inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Submission of the quarterly update to the Board of Supervisor's GAO Committee and the Office of the Mayor, inviting comment.</li> <li>ii. Posting the quarterly update on the PS website homepage, with comments from the Board of Supervisors and Office of the Mayor included for public reference.</li> </ul>  | <p>The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)</p> | <p>The Performance Scorecard website contains many measures which are updated on a regularly basis, including quarterly and monthly measures, and the Controller's Office prepares an annual report to discuss important performance trends from the past year. The measures are public-facing, and the Controller's Office receives feedback on an ongoing basis. The Mayor's Office and Controller's Office are always supportive of this feedback, and will continue making improvements based on that feedback. The Mayor's Office would also welcome additional periodic reporting from the Controller's Office.</p> |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
Mayor's Office Responses

| #    | Recommendations  | 2017 Responses (implementation)   | 2017 Response Text  |
|------|--|---|---|
| R3.1 | <p>In consultation with other SFG entities and community groups, the Office of the Controller should propose a narrowed set of PS indicators, likely not exceeding 30 total, by October 1, 2017; the Board of Supervisor's GAO Committee should be invited to comment on the revised indicators prior to submission to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.</p>  | <p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation in next column)</p>            | <p>The City currently tracks performance data for over 1,000 measures. The Performance Scorecard website represents a more focused set of measures that are the most relevant to the public and policymakers. In addition to focusing on these priority areas, the Performance Scorecard website is meant to present a multi-dimensional picture of City services and overall health and viability of the City itself. In order to do this, the Performance Scorecard includes a broad array of measures, some of which are meant to be simply educational and informative to both the public and policymakers. In collaboration with the Controller's Office, we regularly review the measures reported on the Performance Scorecard website to highlight those that are more important or most informative to the public or policymakers, while also representing the full scope of City services and overall viability. In past attempts to put a hard number, such as 30, on the development of indicators, the process inevitably produces resentment from many pockets of community and city workers who may have felt that important information gets left out. The Mayor prioritizes, and City staff values, that all City efforts are inclusive and considered through an equity lens. When developing indicators the City balances this strong San Francisco value with the need for brevity. This is something the Mayor cares about deeply and is a constant balancing act.</p> |
| R4.1 | <p>The Mayor's Office should ensure that by January 1, 2018 every PS indicator has a linked goal, with all goals approved by the Mayor – these goals comprise the SFG's overarching annual operational plan.</p>   | <p>The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)</p> | <p>This work has been planned for months and is now underway. January 1, 2018 is an ambitious goal given that the Mayor values inclusion and consensus building, and working with 50 departments (whose goals are often a reflection of community engagement practices) will likely require timely and focused deep dives into their data systems and then back to the community if we do not currently have the right inputs. The Mayor's Office is very enthusiastic about this work and the goal is to get it right, setting the right precedent for building strategic plans moving forward.</p>  |
| R6   | <p>Beginning in fiscal year 2018, the revised PS framework should be formally incorporated into the SFG department strategic planning and budgeting process – in particular, the Office of the Mayor should require each department to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Specify within their departmental strategic plans which initiatives directly support the SFG's PS goals most relevant to their operational mandate, and what improvement they project in achieving that goal.</li> <li>ii. Specify within their departmental budget submission how their budget request is directly supportive of improved SFG performance against the PS goals most relevant to their operational mandate.</li> </ul> | <p>The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)</p> | <p>This work has been planned and is currently under way. The Mayor's Office is actively working with all departments to draft brief public-facing summaries of their more complex and detailed strategic plans. These summaries will include the alignment between individual department plans and the Mayor's citywide vision. This work is being performed in tandem with Recommendation R.4.1 above, as it is not always clear to the public how the measures connect with strategy, which ultimately connects with the budget. The City has been and will continue to be committed to this endeavor. Strategy and performance must be made more accessible to a broader public.</p>  |
| R7.1 | <p>The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current housing affordability indicators based on recommendations from the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and submit the revisions to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.</p>   | <p>The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column)</p> | <p>The Mayor's Office and Controller's Office are currently working with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and other related City departments, to include updated housing measures on the Performance Scorecard website. We anticipate that these measures will be available to report on the Performance scorecard website by January 2018.</p>   |

2016-17 Civil Grand Jury  
Accelerating SF Government Performance:  
Mayor's Office Responses

| #    | Recommendations   | 2017 Responses (implementation)  | 2017 Response Text   |
|------|---|--|--|
| R7.2 | The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current homelessness indicators based on recommendations from the DSHS Director and the examples of other leading cities, and submit the revised indicators to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval.          | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column) | The Mayor's Office agrees that the current homelessness indicators should be expanded. The newly formed Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is currently engaged in developing performance measures. Once those measures are developed and have reliable baseline data, the Mayor's Office would be amenable to reviewing and approving those measures for inclusion on the Performance Scorecard website.   |
| R7.3 | The Controller's Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current crime/street safety indicators based on recommendations from the Chief of Police and the examples of other leading cities, and submit the revised indicators to the Office of the Mayor for review and approval. | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column) | Currently, the Controller's Office collects performance measures on 12 public safety-related measures from the Police Department. These measures, which are collected and reported by most law enforcement agencies, include response times to Priority A and B calls, violent and property crimes, and traffic/pedestrian safety indicators. The Police Department is currently engaged with an outside consultant to develop a strategic plan and outcome measures based on the recommendations included in the Department of Justice (DOJ) Community Oriented Policing report from October 2016. The Mayor's Office will work with the Chief of Police and the Controller's Office to ensure measures are informative to the community, and develop additional measures based on reform efforts. Appropriate measures will be included on the Performance Scorecard website to measure progress in implementing critical reforms from the DOJ report. |
| R7.4 | Consistent with Recommendation P4, the Office of the Mayor should ensure that, by January 1, 2018, each of the primary housing affordability, homelessness and crime indicators have associated goals.  | The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future ( timeframe for implementation noted in next column) | The Mayor's Office is working with the Controller's Office and City departments to develop appropriate targets or goals for all measures, where appropriate, and has regular quarterly meetings to discuss progress. As new or revised measures are developed around these areas, we will continue to assess the appropriateness of establishing targets.  |