


# Gender Analysis
# San Francisco Commissions and Boards
# FY 2020-2021

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

City and County of San Francisco
**Department on the Status of Women**

London N. Breed
Mayor

Dear Honorable Mayor London N. Breed and Board of Supervisors:

Please find attached the 2021 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report. We are pleased to share that under Mayor Breed's leadership, representation of women, people of color, and women of color on policy bodies continues to increase. Mayoral appointments are more diverse based on gender and race compared to both supervisorial appointments and appointments in general.

Overall, policy bodies have a larger percentage of women, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and Veterans[1] than the general San Francisco population. The percentage of women of color and people with disabilities appointed to policy bodies is near equal to the general population. Fiscal year 2020-2021 saw the largest increase in representation of women on policy bodies since the Department on the Status of Women started collecting data in 2009. Women of color have the highest representation of appointees to date.

Black and African American women and men are notably well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 8 percent of appointees compared to 2.4 percent of the general San Francisco population, and Black men are 4 percent of appointees compared to 2.5 percent of the general San Francisco population. Additionally, almost 1-in-4 appointees who responded to the survey question identify as a member of the LGBTQIA+ community.

Commissions that oversee the largest budgets have members of the LGBTQIA+ community, people with disabilities, and Veterans represented at higher percentages than the general population.

While San Francisco continues to make strides in diversity, there is still work to do in achieving parity of representation for Latinx and Asian groups in appointed positions overall, as well as women, people of color, and women of color on Commissions overseeing the largest budgets. The Department applauds Mayor Breed for remaining committed to diversifying policy body appointments across all diversity categories, including for positions of influence and authority.

Thank you to Department staff who worked on this report and to members of the Commission on the Status of Women for their ongoing advocacy for intersectional gender equity efforts.

Kimberly Ellis, Director of the Department on the Status of Women

[1] "Veterans" refers to people who have served and/or have an immediate family member who has served in the military.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Table of Contents


I. Introduction ..... 1

II. Findings ..... 2

- A. Gender ..... 2
- B. Race and Ethnicity ..... 5
- C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender ..... 8
- D. LGBTQIA+ Identity ..... 10
- E. Disability Status ..... 11
- F. Veteran Status ..... 12
- G. Policy Bodies by Budget ..... 14
- H. Comparison of Advisory Body, Commission, and Board Demographics ..... 16
- I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees ..... 17
- J. Religious Affiliations ..... 18

III. Methodology and Limitations ..... 19

IV. Conclusion ..... 21

V. Appendix ..... 23

VI. Acknowledgements ..... 29

## Table of Figures


Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2021 ..... 2

Figure 2: 12-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies ..... 2

Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019 ..... 3

Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019 ..... 4

Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2021 ..... 4

Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies ..... 5

Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2021 ..... 6

Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017 ..... 7

Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017 ..... 7

Figure 10: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies ..... 8

Figure 11: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2021 ..... 9

Figure 12: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019 ..... 9

Figure 13: LGBTQIA+ Identity of Appointees, 2021 ..... 10

Figure 14: LGBTQIA+ Population of Appointees, 2019 ..... 11

Figure 15: Disability Status of Appointees, 2021 ..... 11

Figure 16: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2021 ..... 12

Figure 17: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2019 ..... 13

Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service, 2021 ..... 13

Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2021 ..... 14

Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2020-2021 ..... 15

Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2021 ..... 15

Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2021 ..... 16

Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2021 ..... 17

Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2021 ..... 18

Figure 25: Religious Affiliations of Appointees, 2021 ..... 19

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021 ..... 23

Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017 ..... 28

## Executive Summary

In 2008, San Francisco voters approved a City Charter Amendment (section 4.101) establishing as City policy for the membership of Commissions and Boards to reflect the diversity of San Francisco's population and appointing officials be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates. Additionally, it requires the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every two years.

The 2021 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report (2021 Gender Analysis Report) evaluates representation of the following groups across appointments to San Francisco policy bodies:

- Women
- People of color
- LGBTQIA+ individuals
- People with disabilities
- Veterans (or people who have immediate family members that have served)
- Various religious affiliations

The report includes policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and Advisory Bodies, in addition to Commissions and Boards.

This year, data was collected from 92 policy bodies and from a total of 349 members, mostly appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The policy bodies surveyed for the 2021 Gender Analysis Report fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney.[2] The first category, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The report examines policy bodies and appointees both comprehensively as a whole and separately by the two categories.

Several changes were made to the survey questions for the 2021 Gender Analysis Report. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) categories were aligned with the latest classifications used by the Office of Transgender Initiatives. The classification of Veteran Status was also expanded to include individuals with close family members that have served in the military and armed forces. This addition to Veteran Status was adopted based on feedback from previous reports.

While the overall number of policy bodies that submitted data increased compared to 2019, the total number of individual members who participated in the survey was dramatically less than the number who participated in 2019. Due to the pandemic, data collection methods

[2] "Sec. 3.1-103. Filing Officers." *American Legal Publishing Corporation*, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_campaign/0-0-0-979.

were limited compared to previous years, including the ability to conduct paper surveys and in-person meetings. Reliance on online surveying significantly reduced the level of participation, despite three to five direct contact efforts with policy bodies via phone and email. Moving forward, in addition to collecting data through paper/in-person surveys, when possible, the Department on the Status of Women recommends that all policy body appointees be required to take a training on the Gender Analysis survey process, alongside the required Ethics training, to guarantee participation.

Similarly, due to census data not being collected during COVID-19, updated demographic information on the general population of San Francisco was not available for years more recent than 2019. In this report, data on the San Francisco population references data from previous years (2015-2019) populations.

## Key Findings

### *Gender*

- Women's representation on policy bodies is 55%, above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- FY 2021 oversaw the largest increase in the representation of women on San Francisco policy bodies since 2009.




### *Race and Ethnicity*

- The representation of people of color on policy bodies is 54%. Comparatively, in San Francisco, 62% of the population identifies with a race other than white.
- While the overall representation of people of color has increased since the 2019 report at 50%, representation has still decreased compared to 57% in 2015.
- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies as compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 15% of the population but make up only 9% of appointees. Asian individuals are 36% of the population but make up only 26% of appointees.



### *Race and Ethnicity by Gender*




- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population and 32% of appointees. This 4% increase is the highest representation of women of color appointees to date.

- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

- Both white women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. White women are 25% of appointees compared to 17% of the San Francisco population. White men are 21% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.

- Black and African American women and men are well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 8% of appointees compared to 2.4% of the population, and Black men are 4% of appointees compared to 2.5% of the population.

- Latinx women are 7% of the San Francisco population but 4% of appointees, and Latinx men are 7% of the population but 4% of appointees.

- Asian women are 17% of the San Francisco population but 15% of appointees, and Asian men are 15% of the population but 11% of appointees.

### *Additional Demographics*

- Out of the 74% of appointees who responded to the survey question on LGBTQIA+ identity, 23% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, nonbinary, queer, or questioning, and 77% of appointees identify as straight/heterosexual.

- Out of the 70% of appointees who responded to the question on Disability Status, 12.6% identify as having one or more disabilities, which is just above parity of the 12% of the adult population with a Disability Status in San Francisco.

- Out of the 67% of appointees who responded to the question on Veteran Status, 22% have served in the military (or have an immediate family member who has served) compared to 3% of the San Francisco population (census data on military service does not include immediate family members who have served).

### *Proxies for Influence: Budget and Authority*

- Although women are half of all appointees, those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets have fewer women, and especially fewer women of color. Meanwhile, representation of women on Boards and Commissions with the smallest budgets are just below parity with the San Francisco population.

- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets compared to overall appointees.

- The percentage of total women is greater on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 60% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 53% of appointees on Commissions and Boards. The percentage of women of color on Advisory Bodies is also higher than on Commissions and Boards.

### *Appointing Authorities*

- Mayoral appointments include 60% women, 59% people of color, and 37% women of color, which is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointments and total appointments.

**Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population**

| | Women | People of Color | Women of Color | LGBTQIA+ | Disability Status | Veteran Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Francisco Population** | 49% | 62% | 32% | 6%-15%* | 12% | 2.7% |
| Total Appointees | 55% | 54% | 32% | 23% | 13% | 22% |
| 10 Largest Budgeted Commissions and Boards | 43% | 44% | 21% | 16% | 15% | 20% |
| 10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions and Boards | 48% | 43% | 29% | 17% | 9% | 12% |
| Commissions and Boards | 53% | 53% | 30% | 18% | 11% | 21% |
| Advisory Bodies | 60% | 53% | 33% | 31% | 15% | 20% |

*San Francisco population estimates come from the 2017 and 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection and Analysis Report, 2021.*

**Note: Estimates vary by source. See page 16 for a detailed breakdown.*

***Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data is unavailable for race/ethnicity, LGBTQIA+ status, Disability Status, and Veteran Status in 2021. Therefore, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.*

## I. Introduction

Inspired by the fourth U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.[3] In 2002, the CEDAW Ordinance was revised to address the intersection of race and gender and incorporate reference to the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Race Discrimination. The Ordinance requires the City to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies "gender analysis" as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

In 2007, the Department on the Status of Women conducted the first gender analysis to evaluate the number of women appointed to City Commissions and Boards. The findings of this analysis informed a City Charter Amendment developed by the Board of Supervisors for the June 2008 Election. This City Charter Amendment (section 4.101) was overwhelmingly approved by voters and made it City policy that:

- The membership of Commissions and Boards are to reflect the diversity of San Francisco's population,
- Appointing officials are to be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates, and
- The Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every two years.

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report examines the representation of women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ individuals, people with disabilities, Veterans, and religious affiliations of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. As was the case for the 2019 Gender Analysis Report, this year's analysis involved increased outreach to policy bodies as compared to previous analyses that were limited to Commissions and Boards. As a result, the data collection and analysis examine a more diverse and expansive layout of City policy bodies. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney. The first category, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of methodology and limitations can be found on page 27.

[3] San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 33.A. http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_Chapter33A.

## II. Findings

Many aspects of San Francisco's diversity are reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis includes data from 92 policy bodies, of which 788 of the 979 seats are filled, leaving 20% vacant. As outlined below in Figure 1, slightly more than half of appointees are women and people of color, 32% are women of color, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+, 13% have a disability, and 22% are Veterans.

**Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2021**

| Appointee Demographics | Percentage of Appointees |
|---|---|
| Women (n=349) | 55% |
| People of Color (n=341) | 54% |
| Women of Color (n=341) | 32% |
| LGBTQIA+ Identifying (n=334) | 23% |
| People with Disabilities (n=349) | 13% |
| Veteran Status (n=349) | 22% |

However, further analysis reveals underrepresentation of particular groups. Subsequent sections present comprehensive data analysis providing comparison to previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQIA+ identity, Disability Status, Veteran Status, religious affiliations, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.

### A. Gender

On San Francisco policy bodies, 55% of appointees identify as women, which is above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 49%. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017, with a slight increase to 51% in 2019. This increase could be partly due to the larger sample size used in the 2019 analysis compared to previous years. A 12-year comparison shows that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of ten percentage points.

**Figure 2: 12-year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies**



Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2017 and 2019. The Commission on the Status of Women is currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women since 2015. The Aging and Adult Services Commission, Health Commission, and Library Commission are all at 71%, respectively.

**Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with the Highest Percentages of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019**

| Policy Body | Percent of Women | Response Rate | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commission on the Status of Women | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Arts Commission | 79% | 100% | 67% | 60% |
| Children and Families (First 5) Commission | 75% | 75% | 100% | 100% |
| Aging and Adult Services Commission | 71% | 86% | 57% | 40% |
| Health Commission | 71% | 100% | 43% | 29% |
| Library Commission | 71% | 100% | 71% | 80% |

Out of the Commissions and Boards in this section, 6 have 40% or less women. The Commissions and Boards with the lowest representation of women are displayed in Figure 4. The lowest percentage is found on the Board of Examiners, which has 90% of responses from the Board, but 0 members identifying as women. Unfortunately, demographic data is unavailable for the Board of Examiners for 2017, however there was 0% of female representation in 2019 as well. The Police Commission, Human Services Commission, and Access Appeals Commission all have entirely completed the demographics survey at 100%, yet still have some of the lowest percentages of women at 20%. It should be noted that policy bodies with a small number of members, such as the Residential Users Appeal Board (which currently has two members), means that minimal changes in its demographic composition greatly impacts percentages. Additionally, several policy bodies had low response rates to the demographics survey, ultimately impacting the representation for their respective policy body accordingly.

**Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019**

| Policy Body | Percent of Women | Response Rate | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential Users Appeal Board | 0% | 50% | 0% | N/A |
| Board of Examiners | 0% | 90% | 0% | N/A |
| Assessment Appeals Board No. 3 | 0% | 67% | 50% | N/A |
| Assessment Appeals Board No. 2 | 0% | 100% | 50% | N/A |
| Rent Board Commission | 10% | 60% | 44% | 30% |
| Small Business Commission | 14% | 43% | 43% | 43% |
| Retirement System Board | 14% | 57% | 43% | 43% |
| Health Service Board | 14% | 43% | 33% | 29% |
| Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee | 14% | 14% | 50% | N/A |
| Treasure Island Development Authority | 17% | 50% | 50% | 43% |
| Public Utilities Commission | 20% | 60% | 67% | 40% |
| Police Commission | 20% | 100% | 43% | 29% |

**Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019, Continued**

| Policy Body | Percent of Women | Response Rate | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Human Services Commission | 20% | 100% | 40% | 20% |
| Access Appeals Commission | 20% | 100% | N/A | N/A |
| Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board | 25% | 75% | 33% | 33% |
| Ethics Commission | 25% | 25% | 100% | 33% |

**Commission and Boards with 70% response rates or higher are highlighted in grey.*

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of women. This is the second year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years before 2019 is unavailable. Figure 5 below displays the five Advisory Bodies with the highest representations of women. Due to a lack of survey responses from several Advisory Bodies, analysis on the five lowest representations of women is unavailable. The Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee has the greatest representation of women at 67%, followed closely by the Citizen's Committee on Community Development at 63%.

**Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2021**

| Policy Body | Percent of Women | Response Rate | 2019 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee | 67% | 78% | 89% |
| Citizens' Committee on Community Development | 63% | 63% | 75% |
| Ballot Simplification Committee | 50% | 75% | 75% |
| Immigrant Rights Commission | 43% | 57% | 54% |
| Municipal Green Building Task Force | 43% | 67% | 50% |

## B. Race and Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected from 341 participants, or 98% of the surveyed appointees. Although half of appointees identify as a race or ethnicity other than white or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population of 62%. The representation of people of color has increased since 2009 but has decreased following 2015. The number of appointees analyzed increased substantially in 2017 and 2019, as compared to 2015. These larger data samples have coincided with smaller percentages of people of color.

**Figure 6: 12-year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies**




The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Nearly half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by 6 percentage points. The Black community is represented on appointed policy bodies at 11% compared to 6% of the population of San Francisco.[4] This is a decrease of representation compared to the 14% representation in 2019. Characterizing these as overrepresentations is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years, while the San Francisco population has declined over the same period.[5]

[4] US Census Bureau, 2018, Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045218.

[5] Samir Gambhir and Stephen Menendian, "Racial Segregation in the Bay Area, Part 2," Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society (2018).

Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian or Latinx. While the Asian population is 36% of the San Francisco population, they make up 26% of appointees. While the Latinx population of San Francisco is 15%, 9% of appointees are Latinx. Although there is a small population of Native Americans and Alaska Natives in San Francisco of 0.4%, only one (0.3%) surveyed appointee identified themselves as such. The San Francisco population of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders is 0.3%, which slightly less than the 0.6% of identifying appointees.

**Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2021**




*Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data is unavailable for race/ethnicity in 2021. Therefore, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.*

The next two figures illustrate Commissions and Boards with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 8, the Commission on the Status of Women holds the highest representation of people of color at 86%, with a 100% response rate. Both the Health Commission and Juvenile Probation Commission have decreased their percentages of people of color since 2019 and 2017.

**Figure 8: Commission and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017**

| Policy Body | Percent of POC | Response Rate | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commission on the Status of Women | 86% | 100% | 71% | 71% |
| Police Commission | 80% | 100% | 71% | 71% |
| Arts Commission | 71% | 100% | 60% | 53% |
| Health Commission | 71% | 100% | 86% | 86% |
| Library Commission | 71% | 100% | 57% | 60% |
| Juvenile Probation Commission | 67% | 83% | 100% | 86% |
| Board of Appeals | 60% | 100% | 40% | 40% |
| Fire Commission | 60% | 100% | 40% | 60% |
| Human Services Commission | 60% | 100% | 40% | 60% |
| Asian Art Commission | 54% | 81% | 59% | 59% |
| Assessment Appeals Board No.2 | 50% | 100% | 63% | N/A |
| Children and Families (First 5) Commission | 50% | 75% | 75% | 63% |

There are 28 Commissions and Boards that have 40% or less appointees who identified a racial and ethnic category other than white. None of the current appointees of the Access Appeals Commission identified as people of color. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Commission remains at 14% representation since 2019. The Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee and Assessment Appeals Board No.1 are both at 17% representation for people of color. Lastly, the Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board had a large drop in representation of people of color going from 67% in 2019 to 25% this year.

**Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017**

| Policy Body | Percent of POC | Response Rate* | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential Users Appeal Board | 0% | 50% | 50% | N/A |
| Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee | 0% | 14% | 75% | N/A |
| Building Inspection Commission | 0% | 50% | 14% | 14% |
| Access Appeals Commission | 0% | 100% | N/A | N/A |
| Small Business Commission | 14% | 43% | 43% | 50% |
| Historic Preservation Commission | 14% | 71% | 14% | 17% |
| Health Service Board | 14% | 43% | 50% | 29% |
| Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee | 17% | 100% | N/A | N/A |
| Assessment Appeals Board No.1 | 17% | 100% | 20% | N/A |
| War Memorial Board of Trustees | 18% | 45% | 18% | 18% |
| Public Utilities Commission | 20% | 60% | 0% | 33% |
| Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board | 25% | 75% | 67% | 67% |

**Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017, Continued**

| Policy Body | Percent of POC | Response Rate* | 2019 Percent | 2017 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ethics Commission | 25% | 25% | 50% | 67% |
| Retirement System Board | 29% | 57% | 29% | 29% |
| Recreation and Park Commission | 29% | 43% | 43% | 43% |
| Rent Board Commission | 30% | 60% | 33% | 50% |

*Commission and Boards with 70% response rates or higher are highlighted in grey.*

## C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

Both white men and women are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies, while Asian and Latinx men and women are underrepresented. The representation of women of color at 32% is equal to the San Francisco population of 32%, which is a notable increase compared to the 2019 percentage of 28%. Meanwhile, men of color are 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

**Figure 10: 12-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies**




The following figures present the breakdown for appointees and the San Francisco population by race, ethnicity, and gender. Both white men and women are overrepresented, holding 24% and 20% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population. Asian men and women are slightly underrepresented with Asian women making up 15% of appointees compared to 17% of the population, while Asian men comprise 11% of appointees and 15% of the population. Latinx men and women are also slightly underrepresented, with Latinx men and women comprising 4% of appointees each and 7% of the population each. Black men and women are well-represented with Black women comprising 8% of appointees, compared to 2.4% of the general San Francisco population, and Black men comprising 4% of appointees,

compared to 2.5% of the general San Francisco population. Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander men and women, and multiracial women are below parity with the population. Similarly, although Native American and Alaska Native men and women make up only 0.4% of San Francisco's population, only one (0.3%) of the surveyed appointees identified as such.

**Figure 11: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2021**




**Figure 12: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity**



## D. LGBTQIA+ Identity

LGBTQIA+ identity data was collected from 334 participants, or 96% of the surveyed appointees. This is a notable increase in data on LGBTQIA+ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQIA+ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQIA+ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, greater Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQIA+ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the California LGBTQIA+ population is 5.3%[6]. The LGBTQIA+ population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,[7] while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBTQIA+[8] .

Of the appointees who responded to this question, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+ and 77% identify as straight or heterosexual. Of the LGBTQIA+ appointees, 56% identify as gay/lesbian, 20% as bisexual, 9% as queer, 9% as transgender, 2% as questioning, and 4% as other LGBTQIA+ identities. Data on LGBTQIA+ identity by race was not captured. Efforts to capture data on LGBTQIA+ identity by race for future reports would enable more intersectional analysis.

**Figure 13: LGBTQIA+ Identity of Appointees, 2021**




[6] https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/adult-lgbt-pop-us/

[7] Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LBGT Percentage," GALLUP (March 20, 2015) https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbtpercentage.aspx?utm_source=Social%20Issues&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=tiles.

[8] Gary J. Gates, "Same Sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey," The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation Law and Public Policy, UCLA School of Law (2006).

**Figure 14: LGBTQIA+ Population of Appointees, 2021**




## E. Disability Status

Overall, more than one in twenty adults in San Francisco live with one or more disabilities. Data on Disability Status was obtained from nearly 100% of the appointees who participated in the survey. 12.6% of participating appointees reported to have one or more disabilities. Of these appointees with one or more disabilities, 56% are women, 30% are men, 2% are trans women, 5% are trans men, and 7% are nonbinary individuals.

**Figure 15: Disability Status of Appointees, 2021**



**Figure 16: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2021**




## F. Veteran Status

Overall, 2.7% of the adult population in San Francisco have served in the military. Data on Veteran status was obtained from 334 appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 334 appointees who responded to this question, 22% served in the military. Men comprise 47.2% and women make up 51.4% of the total number of Veteran appointees. Of participating appointees, 1.4% are nonbinary individuals. Veteran status data on transgender and gender-nonconforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable. The vast increase of appointees with military service compared to 2019's 7.1% of appointees is likely due to the change in wording in the 2021 Gender Analysis Report from previous years, which defines an appointee with Veteran status as someone with a spouse or direct family member who has served, as opposed to only oneself or their spouse. This change was implemented based on feedback from prior reports. Future analyses may want to ask separate questions regarding one's personal experience with military service and one's familial ties to military service, in order to distinguish the most accurate and aggregated data results.

**Figure 17: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender***




**This graph is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data on the gendered population of Veterans in San Francisco is unavailable. This graph fails to identify nonbinary individuals with military experience. However, this graph highlights the gender disparity amongst male and female Veterans, with only 0.2% identifying as women.*

**Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service, 2021**



**Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2021**




## G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This 2021 Gender Analysis Report examines the demographic representativeness of policy bodies by budget size. Budget size is used as a proxy for influence. Although this report has expanded the scope of analysis to include more policy bodies compared to previous reports, this section of analysis was limited to Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members file financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission.

Overall, appointees from the 10 **largest** budgeted Commissions and Boards are 44% people of color, 43% women, and 21% women of color. Appointees from the 10 **smallest** budgeted Commissions and Boards are 43% people of color, 48% women, and 29% women of color.

Representation for women, women of color, and overall people of color is below parity with the population on both the 10 smallest and 10 largest budgeted bodies. The representation of women and women of color is greater on smaller budgeted policy bodies by 5% and 8%, respectively. The representation of people of color is 1% higher on Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets.

**Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2020-2021**




**Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2021**

| Policy Body | FY20-21 Budget | Total Seats | Filled Seats | Response Rate | Women | Women of Color | People of Color |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Health Commission | $2.7B | 7 | 7 | 100% | 71% | 43% | 71% |
| Public Utilities Commission | $1.43B | 5 | 5 | 60% | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| Airport Commission | $1.37B | 5 | 5 | 100% | 40% | 0% | 40% |
| MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission | $1.26B | 7 | 6 | 50% | 33% | 33% | 50% |
| Human Services Commission | $604M | 5 | 5 | 100% | 20% | 0% | 60% |
| Aging and Adult Services Commission | $435M | 7 | 7 | 86% | 71% | 29% | 43% |
| Fire Commission | $414M | 5 | 5 | 100% | 40% | 20% | 60% |
| Library Commission | $341B | 7 | 7 | 100% | 71% | 43% | 71% |
| Recreation and Park Commission | $231.6M | 7 | 7 | 43% | 29% | 14% | 29% |
| Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee | $171.5M | 11 | 7 | 14% | 14% | 0% | 0% |
| **Total** | **$8.9B** | **66** | **61** | **74%** | **58%** | **29%** | **60%** |

**Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2021**

| Policy Body | FY20-21 Budget | Total Seats | Filled Seats | Response Rate | Women | Women of Color | People of Color |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commission on the Status of Women | $9M | 7 | 7 | 100% | 100% | 86% | 86% |
| Ethics Commission | $6.5M | 5 | 4 | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% |
| Small Business Commission | $3.5M | 7 | 7 | 43% | 14% | 0% | 14% |
| Film Commission | $1.5M | 11 | 11 | 100% | 45% | 27% | 45% |
| Civil Service Commission | $1.3M | 5 | 5 | 100% | 60% | 20% | 40% |
| Entertainment Commission | $1.2M | 7 | 7 | 100% | 29% | 14% | 43% |
| Board of Appeals | $1.2M | 5 | 5 | 100% | 40% | 20% | 60% |
| Assessment Appeals Board No.1 | $701,348 | 8 | 6 | 100% | 50% | 0% | 17% |
| Local Agency Formation Commission | $427,685 | 7 | 4 | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% |
| Sunshine Ordinance Task Force | $172,373 | 11 | 9 | 89% | 56% | 44% | 44% |
| **Total** | **$25.5M** | **73** | **65** | **86%** | **56%** | **35%** | **51%** |

## H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

The comparison of the two policy body categories in this section provides another proxy for influence. Commissions and Boards whose members file disclosures of economic interest have greater decision-making authority in San Francisco than Advisory Bodies whose members do not file economic interest disclosures. The percentages of total women, LGBTQIA+ people, people with disabilities, and women of color are larger for total appointees on Advisory Bodies. However, the percentages of Veterans on Commissions and Boards slightly exceeds the percentage on Advisory Bodies, and both Commissions and Boards and Advisory Bodies have 53% people of color.

**Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2021**




## I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 60% women, 37% women of color, and 59% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 56% women, 36% women of color, and 58% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 55% women, 32% women of color, and 54% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part to the appointment selection process for each authority. The 11-member Board of Supervisors only sees applicants for specific bodies through the 3- member Rules Committee or by designees, stipulated in legislation (e.g., "renter," "landlord," "consumer advocate"), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.

**Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2021**




## J. Religious Affiliations

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report collected data on religious affiliations to fully examine the demographics and representation of appointees. This is the first-year religious affiliations have been examined. Figure 25 illustrates the religious demographics of appointees, with the largest number of appointees identifying as Christian (30%), and the smallest number of appointees identifying as Hindu (1%) or Muslim (1%).

**Figure 25: Religious Affiliations of Appointees, 2021**




## III. Methodology and Limitations

This report focuses on City and County of San Francisco Commissions, Boards, task forces, councils, and committees that have the majority of members appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors and have jurisdiction limited to the City. The 2021 Gender Analysis Report reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital survey. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the normal outreach method of paper surveys and in-person meetings was unavailable, ultimately leaving all survey outreach and correspondence to be conducted online. Unfortunately, obtaining the data strictly online had a significant negative impact on participation rates. Following initial email outreach, policy bodies were contacted three to five times via email and phone, including two emails to Department Heads from Department on the Status of Women Director, Kimberly Ellis. All possible measures were taken to obtain accurate and complete data. While participation rates are lower than the 2019 Gender Analysis Report, this report features the most diverse individual responses, as well as participation of the largest number of Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies to date.

Data was requested from 109 policy bodies and acquired from 92 of those bodies, a total of 349 appointees. Comparatively, the 2019 Gender Analysis Report received data from 84 policy bodies (380 Commission and Boards and 389 Advisory Bodies), a total of 741 total appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, Disability Status, Veteran Status, or religious affiliations were among data elements collected on a *voluntary* basis. Therefore, responses were incomplete or unavailable for some appointees but are included to the extent possible.

As the fundamental objective of this report is to surface patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information in this report. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories. Only policy bodies with full data on gender and race for all appointees were included in sections comparing demographics of individual bodies. It should be noted that for policy bodies with a small number of members, the change of a single individual greatly impacts the percentages of demographic categories. This should be kept in mind when interpreting these percentages.

Several changes were made to the survey questions since the 2019 Gender Analysis Report with the goal of distinguishing all possible areas of underrepresentation. In addition to updating SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity) categories to align with the latest classifications used by the Office of Transgender Initiatives, the 2021 Gender Analysis Report expanded its classification of Veteran Status to include individuals with close family members that have served, as opposed to only oneself or their spouse. This addition to Veteran Status was adopted based on feedback from previous reports.

As acquiring data was the biggest limitation of this report, ensuring participation from all policy bodies could significantly improve or further efforts to address underrepresentation. Some methods of guaranteeing participation include surveying all appointees during their initial onboarding training with the City, as well as relying on paper/in-person survey outreach for future reports.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute.[9] This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. The second category encompasses Advisory Bodies whose members do not submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. Depending on the analysis criteria in each section of this report, the surveyed policy bodies and appointees are either examined comprehensively as a whole or examined separately in the two categories designated by the Office of the City Attorney.

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Due to census data not being collected during COVID-19, updated demographic information on the general population of San Francisco was not available for years more recent than 2019. Comparisons of 2021 demographic data to data on the San Francisco population reference population data from previous years (2015-2019) and will be noted as such. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

---

"List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute," Office of the City Attorney, https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf, (August 25, 2017).

## IV. Conclusion

Since the first Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The 2021 Gender Analysis Report finds the percentage of women appointees is 55%, which exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, the representation of women of color has increased to 32%, which is 4% higher than 2019 representation, matching the San Francisco population. Most notably, underrepresented are individuals identifying as Asian, making up 36% of the San Francisco population but only 26% of appointees, and Latinx-identifying individuals who make up 15% of the population but only 9% of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees relative to their San Francisco population, 31%.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women of color are underrepresented on Commission and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets. Women comprise 43% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies compared to the population of 49%, and women of color comprise 21% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, with the San Francisco population at 32%. Comparatively, women are 48% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 29% of appointees. However, the representation of people of color is higher on larger budgeted policy bodies by 1%. People of color make up 44% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 43% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies compared to 54% of total appointees. The San Francisco population of people of color exceeds these percentages at 62%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed demographic characteristics of appointees on Commissions and Boards who file disclosures of economic interest and have decision-making authority and appointees on Advisory Bodies who do not file economic interest disclosures. Over half (60%) of appointees on Advisory Bodies are women, while 53% of appointees on Commissions and Boards are women. Ultimately, women comprise a higher percentage of appointees on Advisory Bodies compared to Commissions and Boards.

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report found a relatively high representation of LGBTQIA+ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. For the appointees that provided LGBTQIA+ identity information, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+ with the largest subset identifying as gay or lesbian (56%), 16% of appointees from the largest budgeted policy bodies identify as LGBTQIA+, and 17% from the smallest budgeted bodies. However, there is a significant difference of LGBTQIA+ representation when comparing Commissions and Boards (18%) and Advisory Bodies (31%). The representation of appointees with disabilities is 13%, slightly exceeding the 12% population. Veterans are highly represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 22% compared to the Veteran population of 2.7%, which could be due to differences in each source's classification of Veteran Status.

Additionally, this report evaluates and compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color appointees by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of

all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointees include 60% women, 37% women of color, and 59% people of color, which overall is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointees and total appointees.

This report is intended to advise the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and other appointing authorities, as they select appointments to policy bodies for the City and County of San Francisco. In the spirit of the 2008 City Charter Amendment that establishes this biennial Gender Analysis Report requirement and the importance of diversity on San Francisco policy bodies, efforts to address gaps in diversity and inclusion should remain at the forefront when making appointments, in order to accurately reflect the population of San Francisco.

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various Policy Body members, Commission secretaries, and Department staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies, particularly Department Interns Charly De Nocker and Brooklynn McPherson for the data collection and analysis of this report.

**San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women**
President Breanna Zwart
Vice President Dr. Shokooh Miry
Commissioner Sophia Andary
Commissioner Sharon Chung
Commissioner Dr. Anne Moses
Commissioner Dr. Raveena Rihal
Commissioner Ani Rivera

Kimberly Ellis, Director
Department on the Status of Women

This report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, **https://sfgov.org/dosw/gender-analysis-reports.**

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94102
sfgov.org/dosw
**dosw@sfgov.org**
415.252.2570

## Appendix

### Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021

| Policy Body* | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY20-21 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Access Appeals Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$0** | **20%** | **0%** | **0%** | **100%** |
| Advisory Committee of Street Artists and Craft Examiners | 5 | 5 | $0 | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| African American Reparations Committee | 15 | 15 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Aging and Adult Services Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 435,011,663** | **71%** | **29%** | **43%** | **86%** |
| **Airport Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 1,370,000,000** | **40%** | **0%** | **40%** | **100%** |
| Animal Control and Welfare Commission | 7 | 7 | $0 | 29% | 14% | 29% | 43% |
| **Arts Commission** | **15** | **14** | **$ 23,762,015** | **79%** | **57%** | **71%** | **100%** |
| **Asian Art Commission** | **27** | **26** | **$ 10,200,000** | **50%** | **35%** | **54%** | **81%** |
| **Assessment Appeals Board No.1** | **8** | **6** | **$ -** | **50%** | **0%** | **17%** | **100%** |
| **Assessment Appeals Board No.2** | **8** | **4** | **$ -** | **0%** | **0%** | **50%** | **100%** |
| **Assessment Appeals Board No.3** | **8** | **3** | **$ -** | **0%** | **0%** | **33%** | **67%** |
| Ballot Simplification Committee | 5 | 4 | $0 | 50% | 0% | 0% | 75% |
| Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee | 12 | 8 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Board of Appeals** | **5** | **5** | **$ 1,177,452** | **40%** | **20%** | **60%** | **100%** |
| **Board Of Examiners** | **13** | **10** | **$0** | **0%** | **0%** | **40%** | **90%** |
| **Building Inspection Commission** | **7** | **6** | **$ 89,600,000** | **33%** | **0%** | **0%** | **50%** |
| Cannabis Oversight Committee | 16 | 16 | $0 | 19% | 31% | 38% | 25% |

**Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued**

| Policy Body* | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY20-21 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Subway Community Advisory Group | 21 | 14 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Children and Families Commission (First 5)** | **9** | **8** | **$ 31,019,003** | **75%** | **50%** | **50%** | **75%** |
| **Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee** | **11** | **7** | **$ 171,481,507** | **14%** | **0%** | **0%** | **14%** |
| Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area | 9 | 8 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Citizen's Committee on Community Development | 9 | 8 | $ 27,755,465 | 63% | 50% | 50% | 63% |
| **Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee** | **9** | **6** | **$0** | **50%** | **0%** | **17%** | **100%** |
| City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission | 5 | 5 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 20% |
| **Civil Service Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 1,286,033** | **60%** | **20%** | **40%** | **100%** |
| Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure | 7 | 6 | $0 | 17% | 17% | 33% | 50% |
| Commission on the Aging Advisory Council | 22 | 14 | $0 | 21% | 0% | 0% | 21% |
| **Commission on the Environment** | **7** | **7** | **$0** | **57%** | **29%** | **43%** | **86%** |
| **Commission on the Status of Women** | **7** | **7** | **$ 9,089,928** | **100%** | **86%** | **86%** | **100%** |
| Committee on Information Technology | 17 | 17 | $ 22,934,703 | 12% | 0% | 6% | 18% |

**Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued**

| Policy Body* | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY20-21 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Elections Commission** | **7** | **5** | **$ 69,000** | **60%** | **20%** | **40%** | **100%** |
| **Entertainment Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$0** | **29%** | **14%** | **43%** | **100%** |
| **Ethics Commission** | **5** | **4** | **$ 6,500,000** | **25%** | **25%** | **25%** | **25%** |
| **Film Commission** | **11** | **11** | **$0** | **45%** | **27%** | **45%** | **100%** |
| **Fire Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 414,360,096** | **40%** | **20%** | **60%** | **100%** |
| **Health Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 2,700,000,000** | **71%** | **43%** | **71%** | **100%** |
| **Health Service Board** | **7** | **7** | **$ 16,500,000** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **43%** |
| **Historic Preservation Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$0** | **29%** | **14%** | **14%** | **71%** |
| Historic Preservation Fund Committee | 7 | 7 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Housing Authority Commission | 7 | 5 | $ 55,800,000 | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| **Human Rights Commission** | **11** | **9** | **$ 13,618,732** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |
| **Human Services Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 604,412,630** | **20%** | **0%** | **60%** | **100%** |
| Immigrant Rights Commission | 15 | 14 | $0 | 43% | 36% | 50% | 57% |
| **Juvenile Probation Commission** | **7** | **6** | **$0** | **50%** | **33%** | **67%** | **83%** |
| **Library Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 341,000,000** | **71%** | **43%** | **71%** | **100%** |
| **Local Agency Formation Commission** | **7** | **4** | **$ 427,685** | **50%** | **50%** | **50%** | **50%** |
| Local Homeless Coordinating Board | 9 | 7 | $ 54,000,000 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Long Term Care Coordinating Council | 40 | 35 | $0 | 9% | 3% | 6% | 14% |
| Mental Health Board | 17 | 9 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission** | **7** | **6** | **$ 1,258,700,000** | **33%** | **33%** | **50%** | **50%** |

**Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued**

| Policy Body* | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY20-21 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Municipal Green Building Task Force | 21 | 21 | $0 | 43% | 24% | 29% | 67% |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council | 15 | 13 | $0 | 15% | 8% | 8% | 15% |
| Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee | 9 | 9 | $0 | 67% | 33% | 44% | 78% |
| Paratransit Coordinating Council | 40 | 25 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee | 23 | 19 | $0 | 26% | 11% | 11% | 53% |
| **Planning Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 62,194,821** | **57%** | **29%** | **43%** | **71%** |
| **Police Commission** | **7** | **5** | **$0** | **20%** | **20%** | **80%** | **100%** |
| **Port Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 125,700,000** | **60%** | **40%** | **40%** | **60%** |
| Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee | 17 | 14 | $0 | 21% | 0% | 14% | 43% |
| **Public Utilities Commission** | **5** | **5** | **$ 1,433,954,907** | **20%** | **20%** | **20%** | **60%** |
| **Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board** | **7** | **4** | **$0** | **25%** | **0%** | **25%** | **75%** |
| **Recreation and Park Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 231,600,000** | **29%** | **14%** | **29%** | **43%** |
| Reentry Council | 7 | 5 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Rent Board Commission** | **10** | **10** | **$ 9,381,302** | **10%** | **0%** | **30%** | **60%** |
| **Residential Users Appeal Board** | **3** | **2** | **$ 900** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **50%** |
| **Retire Health Care Trust Fund Board** | **5** | **5** | **$ 70,000** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |
| **Retirement System Board** | **7** | **7** | **$ 90,000,000** | **14%** | **14%** | **29%** | **57%** |
| **Small Business Commission** | **7** | **7** | **$ 3,505,244** | **14%** | **0%** | **14%** | **43%** |
| SoMa Community Planning Advisory Committee | 11 | 7 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued**

| Policy Body* | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY20-21 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee | 14 | 10 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 10% | 10% |
| Southeast Community Facility Commission | 7 | 7 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Sunshine Ordinance Task Force** | **11** | **9** | **$0** | **56%** | **44%** | **44%** | **89%** |
| Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group | 11 | 6 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Transgender Advisory Committee | 14 | 14 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 21% | 36% |
| **Treasure Island Development Authority** | **7** | **6** | **$0** | **17%** | **17%** | **33%** | **50%** |
| Urban Forestry Council | 15 | 14 | $0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Veterans Affairs Commission | 17 | 16 | $ 150,000 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **War Memorial Board of Trustees** | **11** | **11** | **$ 18,500,000** | **27%** | **18%** | **18%** | **45%** |
| **Workforce Investment Board** | **30** | **27** | **$0** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |
| Youth Commission | 17 | 17 | $0 | 41% | 35% | 71% | 88% |

**Policy Bodies in bold are Commission and Boards, while unbolded bodies are Advisory Bodies.*

**Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017***

| Race/Ethnicity | Total | | Female | | Male | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| San Francisco County, California | 864,263 | - | 423,630 | 49% | 440,633 | 51% |
| White, non-Hispanic or Latino | 353,000 | 38% | 161,381 | 17% | 191,619 | 20% |
| Asian | 295,347 | 31% | 158,762 | 17% | 136,585 | 15% |
| Hispanic or Latinx | 131,949 | 14% | 62,646 | 7% | 69,303 | 7% |
| Some Other Race | 64,800 | 7% | 30,174 | 3% | 34,626 | 4% |
| Black or African American | 45,654 | 5% | 22,311 | 2.4% | 23,343 | 2.5% |
| Two or More Races | 43,664 | 5% | 21,110 | 2.2% | 22,554 | 2.4% |
| Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander | 3,226 | 0.3% | 1,576 | 0.2% | 1,650 | 0.2% |
| Native American and Alaska Native | 3,306 | 0.4% | 1,589 | 0.2% | 1,717 | 0.2% |

*San Francisco Population estimates come from the 2017 and 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.*

**Due to unavailable updated data on San Francisco population, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.*

## Acknowledgments

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various policy body members, commission secretaries, and city staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies. In particular, the Department would like to thank interns Charly De Nocker and Brooklynn McPherson for the data collection and analysis of this report.

**San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women**
President Breanna Zwart
Vice President Dr. Shokooh Miry
Commissioner Sophia Andary
Commissioner Sharon Chung
Commissioner Dr. Anne Moses
Commissioner Dr. Raveena Rihal
Commissioner Ani Rivera

Kimberly Ellis, Director
Department on the Status of Women

This report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, **https://sfgov.org/dosw/gender-analysis-reports.**

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94102
sfgov.org/dosw
**dosw@sfgov.org**
415.252.2570