



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE
TAKING **ACCOUNTABILITY** AND **TRANSPARENCY** TO THE NEXT LEVEL

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS & RESPONSES



GOVERNMENT AUDIT & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SEPTEMBER 6, 2017



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW

2. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

3. RESPONSES & COMMENTS



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE
 TAKING **ACCOUNTABILITY** AND **TRANSPARENCY** TO THE NEXT LEVEL

PRIMARY FOCUS

In view of rising budgets, lack of progress on key issues, and public frustration, the Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) reviewed how the San Francisco Government (SFG) measures and tracks progress in the top areas of public concern (homelessness, housing affordability, and public safety).

ANALYTIC APPROACH

SFG STAFF	EXTERNAL SOURCES	OTHER US CITIES	PREVIOUS CGJ REPORTS
Dozens of interviews w/SFG staff, including all concerned departments	Consulted multiple external experts/sources on gov't performance	Assessed practices of other leading cities (Austin, NYC, Portland, Seattle, etc.)	Expanded on analysis and findings of the CGJ in 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2012-13

SUMMARY FINDINGS

1. The SFG's operational focus, in terms of tracking and measuring progress on the public's gravest concerns, can be improved.
2. The SFG can substantially improve communicating *what* and *how* it is doing to the public.

The associated 8 findings and 14 recommendations represent a **non-partisan blueprint** to accelerate the SFG's performance while enhancing accountability & transparency.



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW

2. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

3. RESPONSES & COMMENTS



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

TAKING **ACCOUNTABILITY** AND **TRANSPARENCY** TO THE NEXT LEVEL

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Civil Grand Jury’s “Accelerating SF Government Performance” report includes 8 findings and 14 recommendations
2. The findings and recommendations concern how the SFG tracks and reports progress to the people, as well as how to improve basic accountability and transparency
3. Recommendations are grouped into two categories:
 - Recommendations ensuring parity in accountability & transparency with other leading cities (P)
 - Recommendations enabling SF to set a new standard for accountability & transparency (N)
4. SFG respondents/co-respondents:
 - Office of the Mayor (co-respondent for 10 recommendations)
 - Office of the Controller (respondent or co-respondent for 10 recommendations)
 - Board of Supervisors (co-respondent for 7 recommendations)



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOV PERFORMANCE: FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS (1 OF 4)

#	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONDENT
1	The broader public is barely aware of the PS framework, diminishing its utility and hampering the SFG’s ability to communicate progress to San Franciscans.	<p>RECOMMENDATION 1</p> <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>	Office of the Mayor Board of Supervisors
2	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.	<p>RECOMMENDATION 2.1</p> <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"> i. Hosting a public press conference, the first of which would occur not later than January 31, 2019, announcing the SFG’s annual performance (P). ii. Posting the SFG Performance report, not later than January 31, 2019, on the Office of the Mayor’s website homepage (P). iii. Submitting the SFG Performance report to the Board of Supervisors for comment (P). 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 (P). 	Office of the Mayor Board of Supervisors Office of the Controller
		<p>RECOMMENDATION 2.2</p> <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"> i. Submission of the quarterly update to the Board of Supervisor’s GAO Committee and the Office of the Mayor, inviting comment (N). 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 (N). 	Office of the Controller Board of Supervisors Office of the Mayor



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOV PERFORMANCE: FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS (2 OF 4)

#	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONDENT
3	The PS framework encompasses too many indicators – some of the indicators are of great importance, whereas others are much less significant.	RECOMMENDATION 3.1 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).	Office of the Mayor Board of Supervisors
		RECOMMENDATION 3.2 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 (N).	Office of the Controller
4	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.	RECOMMENDATION 4.1 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).	Office of the Mayor Board of Supervisors
		RECOMMENDATION 4.2 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 (P).	Office of the Controller
5	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.	RECOMMENDATION 5 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 (N).	Office of the Controller



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOV PERFORMANCE: FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS (3 OF 4)

#	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONDENT
6	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.	<p>RECOMMENDATION 6</p> <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"> 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 (N). 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 (N). 	Office of the Mayor Board of Supervisors
7	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>RECOMMENDATION 7.1</p> <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 Mayor’s Office for review/approval (P).</p>	Office of the Controller Office of the Mayor
		<p>RECOMMENDATION 7.2</p> <p>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 (P).</p>	Office of the Controller Office of the Mayor
		<p>RECOMMENDATION 7.3</p> <p>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 (P).</p>	Office of the Controller Office of the Mayor
		<p>RECOMMENDATION 7.4</p> <p>Consistent w/Recommendation 4.1, the Office of the Mayor should ensure that, by January 1, 2018, each of the primary housing affordability, homelessness & crime indicators have associated goals (P).</p>	Office of the Mayor



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOV PERFORMANCE: FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS (4 OF 4)

#	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONDENT
8	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 and racial equity.	RECOMMENDATION 8 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 (N).	Office of the Controller Board of Supervisors



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW

2. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

3. RESPONSES & COMMENTS



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ACCELERATING SF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE
TAKING **ACCOUNTABILITY** AND **TRANSPARENCY** TO THE NEXT LEVEL

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

1. MAYOR'S OFFICE:

- Agreed to implement 7 recommendations (R2.2, R4.1, R6, R7.1, R7.2, R7.3, R7.4)
- Will not implement 2 recommendations (R2.1, R3.1)
- Confirmed 1 recommendation already implemented (R1)

2. CONTROLLER'S OFFICE:

- Agreed to implement 7 recommendations (R2.2, R3.2, R4.2, R7.1, R7.2, R7.3, R8)
- Will study 1 recommendation further (R5)
- Will not implement 2 recommendations (R2.1, R3.1)

3. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: (TBD)



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
1	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>MAYOR’S OFFICE: This recommendation has been implemented.</p> <p>A direct link to the Scorecard website is linked to the homepage of the Mayor’s website (sfmayor.org) as well as the Controller’s website (http://sfgov.org/scorecards/)</p>	<p>We are pleased the Mayor agreed with this recommendation and placed a link to the Performance Scorecards’ website on the Mayor’s homepage, enabling a wider audience to understand SFG performance.</p> <p>We further note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Placing the Scorecards’ link on the Mayor’s homepage was done following the initiation of this investigation – this was quick and laudable action taken by the Mayor’s Office. ii. The Scorecards’ link on the Mayor’s website is not obvious, requiring users to scroll to the very bottom of the site’s homepage, severely curtailing its accessibility; future updates to the Mayor’s website should address this. iii. The Mayor’s Office did not respond to the recommendation to place a link to the Scorecards on the SFG website’s homepage, which would serve the widest possible audience. We look forward to a response on this specific point.



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
2.1	<p>Consistent with other leading cities such as New York, 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"> i. Hosting a public press conference, the first of which would occur not later than January 31, 2019, (P). ii. Posting the SFG Performance report homepage (P). iii. Submitting the SFG Performance report to the Board of Supervisors for comment (P). iv. Within 30 days of the Board of Supervisors 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 (P). 	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.</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> <p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation below).</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>	<p>We respectfully urge the Mayor’s Office to reconsider. Here’s why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. As noted above, the location of the Scorecards on the Mayor’s Office website homepage is extremely hard to find. ii. There is no indication of how the Mayor’s Office will systematically publicize the Scorecards <i>other</i> than via a single website link – we respectfully request that the Mayor’s Office <i>clarify what direct channels</i> will be used to convey SFG performance information to the public. iii. As noted in our analysis, the Mayor, more than any other SFG official, is accountable for SFG performance and will attract media and public attention in reporting Scorecard results; in contrast, the Controller’s Office is rightly tasked with an impartial role of collecting, validating and posting the information and data.



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
2.2	<p>Commencing in 2018, prepare quarterly updates of the PS framework, inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Submission of the quarterly update to the Board of Supervisor’s Government Audit and Oversight Committee (GAO) and the Office of the Mayor, inviting comment (N). ii. Posting a quarterly update on the PS website homepage, with comments from the Board of Supervisors and Mayor’s included for public reference (N). 	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has note been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>The Performance Scorecard website contains many measures which are updated on a regular basis, including quarterly and monthly measures, and the Controller’s Office prepares an annual report to discuss important performance trends from the last 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> <p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has note been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</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>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s and Controller’s commitment to improve regular public performance reporting through the Performance Scorecards framework.</p> <p>Based on this commitment, we also welcome the opportunity for the Board of Supervisors to provide publicly accessible comments on these regular updates. Doing so would be a strong example of cross-SFG collaboration in support of public accountability and transparency.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive this commitment positively, since it will directly and materially improve public understanding of the SFG’s performance and progress.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
3.1	In consultation with other SFG entities and community groups, the Controller’s Office should provide a narrowed set of PS indicators, likely not exceeding 30 total, by October 1, 2017; the Board of Supervisors 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>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.</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>	<p>We appreciate the Mayor’s commitment to “highlight those measures that are most important...”. Accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. As noted in our analysis, the public overwhelmingly cares most about a small set of topics (homelessness, etc.) – it follows that instead of treating all ~80 indicators equally, a smaller subset should be the focus of what <i>the Mayor regularly reports</i> on to San Franciscans. ii. As noted in our analysis, reputable experts recommend that the total number of priority indicators should not exceed ~20-30 total; whereas the SFG currently has ~80. iii. Narrowing the Scorecards to fewer indicators does not take away from the role of the Controller’s Office in tracking a full spectrum of indicators to ensure the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the public are fully informed on the wider performance of the SFG.



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
3.1	In consultation with other SFG entities and community groups, the Controller’s Office should provide a narrowed set of PS indicators, likely not exceeding 30 total, by October 1, 2017; the Board of Supervisors 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>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.</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>	<p>We appreciate the Controller’s commitment to “continue to refine the selection and quantity of performance measures...”. Accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. As noted in our analysis, the public overwhelmingly cares most about a small set of topics (homelessness, etc.) – it follows that instead of treating all ~80 indicators equally, a smaller subset should be the focus of what <i>the Mayor regularly reports</i> on to San Franciscans. ii. As noted in our analysis, reputable experts recommend that the total number of priority indicators should not exceed ~20-30 total; whereas the SFG currently has ~80. iii. Narrowing the Scorecards to fewer indicators does not take away from the role of the Controller’s Office in tracking a full spectrum of indicators to ensure the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the public are fully informed on the wider performance of the SFG.



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
3.2	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 for some or all indicators and posting this information within the online PS platform, enabling citizens to understand progress in their own neighborhoods (N).	<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has note been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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 the feasibility of expanding such reporting in the coming fiscal year, as recommended.</p>	<p>We appreciate the Controller’s commitment to evaluate the feasibility of including district level reporting in the Performance Scorecard framework according to the suggested timeline.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive this commitment positively, since it will materially improve the ability of the SFG to identify with precision how public service levels vary across different parts of the City – and why.</p>
4.1	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>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has note been, but will be, implemented in the future.</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 in to 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>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s commitment to set goals for every key performance indicator, which is fundamental to ensuring a fully accountable government in the City and County of San Francisco.</p> <p>We also appreciate the Mayor’s desire to work collaboratively with relevant SFG entities in setting these goals.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will receive this commitment positively, since evaluating progress against clear goals is the basis for accountable and transparent government.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
4.2	The Controller’s Office should ensure that by January 1, 2018 the PS framework includes comparative performance figures against prior year goals alongside current year goals, so citizens can see the trend of progress (P).	<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Controller’s commitment to include comparative performance information against prior year goals alongside current goals – doing so will directly improve the public’s understanding <i>of both the trend and recent progress</i> in addressing the greatest public concerns.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive this commitment positively, since it will provide for greater clarity on the overall impact and efficacy of key City services and programs over time.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
5	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 (N).	<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: 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 below).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Controller’s commitment to increasingly link the Performance Scorecard framework with comparative references to better inform the Board of Supervisors and the public about SFG performance. And as we noted in the formal report, the benchmarking the Controller’s Office is currently doing is useful and should be recognized.</p> <p>The point of establishing a set of comparative indices which are readily accessible online is to enable the public to quickly and accurately assess how our City is doing <i>without having to read different reports and/or consult multiple websites.</i></p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
6	<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"> 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 (N). 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 (N). 	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</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>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s commitment to fully integrate the Performance Scorecard framework with the wider SFG strategic planning and budgeting process.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee and the Controller’s Office to be active participants in the move to this integrated performance management framework.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
7.1	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 Mayor’s Office for review and approval (P).	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</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>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s and Controller’s commitment to adopt useful housing affordability indicators to enable San Franciscans to understand the SFG’s performance and progress in this crucial area.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive these commitments positively, since establishing clear and relevant indicators directly enables improved tracking and evaluation of the SFG’s affordability-related programs, services, and associated budget proposals.</p>
		<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p>	



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
7.2	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 (P).	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s and Controller’s commitment to adopt useful homelessness indicators to enable San Franciscans to understand the SFG’s performance and progress in this crucial area.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive these commitments positively, since establishing clear and relevant indicators directly enables improved tracking and evaluation of the SFG’s homelessness-related programs, services, and associated budget proposals.</p>
		<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p>	



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
7.3	<p>The Controller’s Office should update, by January 1, 2018, the current crime and 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 (P).</p>	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable (explanation below).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s commitment to adopt improved public safety indicators to enable San Franciscans to understand the SFG’s performance and progress in this crucial area.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive these commitments positively, since establishing clear and relevant indicators directly enables improved tracking and evaluation of the SFG’s public safety programs, services, and associated budget proposals.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENTS
7.4	<p>Consistent w/Recommendation 4.1, the Office of the Mayor should ensure that, by January 1, 2018, each of the primary housing affordability, homelessness & crime indicators have associated goals (P).</p>	<p>MAYOR’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Mayor’s commitment to set City-wide goals for addressing the key problems of most concern to San Franciscans today.</p> <p>We believe this is a necessary and crucial step toward both <i>enabling</i> effective performance management and accountability on the one hand, and <i>building</i> trust with the public on the other.</p> <p>We expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive this commitment positively, since it will directly improve SFG transparency and provides a clearer basis for evaluating the performance and cost-effectiveness of high priority SFG programs and services.</p>



CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SFG RESPONSES & CGJ COMMENTS

#	CGJ RECOMMENDATION	SFG RESPONSES	CGJ COMMENT
8	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 (N).	<p>CONTROLLER’S OFFICE: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future (timeframe for implementation noted below).</p> <p>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 and on the recommended timeline.</p>	<p>We are pleased to receive the Controller’s commitment to include one or more indicators within the Performance Scorecard framework that directly track(s) the SFG’s progress in addressing social, gender and racial equity issues, and to do so in accordance with the recommended timeline.</p> <p>Noting that multiple members of the Board of Supervisors have actively advocated for greater focus on social, gender and racial equity in SFG policies, programs and budgetary allocations, we expect the Board of Supervisors/GAO Committee will also receive this commitment positively.</p>