 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francis Technology Needs a Culture Shock] 	[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City
	recinology Needs a Culture Shockj
3	Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings
4	and recommendations contained in the 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury report entitled "Deja
5	Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" and
6	urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and
7	recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of
8	the annual budget.
9	
10	WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code Section 933 et seq., the Board of
11	Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
12	Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and
13	WHEREAS, In accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), if a finding or
14	recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a
15	county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head
16	and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the
17	response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over
18	which it has some decision making authority; and
19	WHEREAS, The 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "Déjà Vu All Over Again:
20	San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" is on file with the Clerk of the Board
21	of Supervisors in File No. 120840 which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if
22	set forth fully herein; and
23	WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond
24	to Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23,
25	

1	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 as well as Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,
2	13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; and
3	WHEREAS, Finding No. 1 states: "Delegating the attendance of COIT meetings by the
4	Mayor to a representative sends a negative message to department heads and CIOs that
5	internal citywide technology issues are not a high priority for the Mayor;" and
6	WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: "The Department of Technology continues to be
7	perceived by many of its customers as providing unsatisfactory service in terms of quality,
8	reliability, timeliness, and cost;" and
9	WHEREAS, Finding No. 3 states: "There are consequences to the Department of
10	Technology for failing to deliver timely and high quality services, including the Mayor and
11	Board of Supervisors continually cutting DT's budget;" and
12	WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: "Another consequence to the Department of
13	Technology for unsatisfactory service is the reluctance of departments to participate in
14	citywide initiatives and to give up their operational independence;" and
15	WHEREAS, Finding No. 5 states: "COIT policies and citywide consolidation initiatives
16	are not communicated to Department Heads and CIOs effectively by the Mayor and COIT;"
17	and
18	WHEREAS, Finding No. 6 states: "COIT is not in compliance with the Administrative
19	Code by failing to find and appoint two non-voting, non-City employee members;" and
20	WHEREAS, Finding No. 7 states: "The current citywide ICT organizational structure
21	hinders the City CIO from fully using the established 'authority and responsibility necessary to
22	implement COIT standards, policies, and procedures for all City Departments;" and
23	WHEREAS, Finding No. 8 states: "The strategic role of the City CIO and the
24	operational role of the Director of DT are two fundamentally different and equally full-time
25	jobs;" and

1	WHEREAS, Finding No. 9 states: "Departmental CIOs have no formal forum to
2	communicate with each other or coordinate common technology issues;" and
3	WHEREAS, Finding No. 10 states: "The lack of a functional reporting relationship
4	between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs is a fundamental weakness in implementing
5	common citywide programs;" and
6	WHEREAS, Finding No. 11 states: "Allowing common ICT functions to be addressed
7	and performed on a department-by-department basis has led to duplication of effort and
8	unnecessary spending;" and
9	WHEREAS, Finding No. 12 states: "The five-year ICT plan does not include: (1)
10	ongoing operational activities, and (2) projects currently in progress with prior funding;" and
11	WHEREAS, Finding No. 13 states: "There are no consolidated citywide ICT budget and
12	staffing plans;" and
13	WHEREAS, Finding No. 14 states: "Although COIT, DT, and a City CIO, address
14	technology on a citywide basis, technology is not treated as a distinct citywide organizational
15	entity;" and
16	WHEREAS, Finding No. 15 states: "There is no comprehensive annual reporting on the
17	state of technology within City government presented to the Mayor or the Board of
18	Supervisors;" and
19	WHEREAS, Finding No. 16 states: "There is a scarcity of consolidated citywide data in
20	the technological arena, separate from departmental budgets;" and
21	WHEREAS, Finding No. 17 states: "COIT concentrates on the design and
22	implementation of individual projects rather than citywide costs and savings stemming from
23	these projects;" and
24	WHEREAS, Finding No. 18 states: "There is a need for a citywide ICT asset
25	management system;" and

1	WHEREAS, Finding No. 19 states: "There is a need for a citywide database of ICT
2	personnel;" and
3	WHEREAS, Finding No. 20 states: "There is no effort to gather and utilize
4	comprehensive quantitative data to track how ICT currently functions;" and
5	WHEREAS, Finding No. 21 states: "The ICT 5-year plan is not a strategic plan and
6	does not calculate how changes in ICT systems would impact City operations and costs;" and
7	WHEREAS, Finding No. 22 states: "City ICT managers are experiencing a growing
8	difficulty in hiring technologists with "cutting edge" knowledge, skills, and experience;" and
9	WHEREAS, Finding No. 23 states: "Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard
10	way of hiring technologists is too slow and cumbersome for the business needs of ICT units;"
11	and
12	WHEREAS, Finding No. 24 states: "Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard
13	way of hiring technologists prevents the city from attracting top talent from the private sector;"
14	and
15	WHEREAS, Finding No. 25 states: "City technology culture is based in the belief that
16	operating departments focus on their individual missions at the expense of citywide needs;"
17	and
18	WHEREAS, Finding No. 26 states: "The cooperative attitude among departments and
19	DT previously found by an earlier Civil Grand Jury has faded;" and
20	WHEREAS, Finding No. 27 states: "A department-first perspective, not the citywide
21	perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in a lack of coordination and
22	communication between and among the different departments;" and
23	WHEREAS, Finding No. 28 states: "A department-first perspective, not the citywide
24	perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in duplication of common technology
25	services arid products;" and

1	WHEREAS, Finding No. 29 states: "Department Heads and CIOs do not view the
2	authority granted COIT and the City CIO in the Administrative Code as governing their own
3	plans and actions;" and
4	WHEREAS, Finding No. 30 states: "Neither COIT nor the City CIO behave as if they
5	fully believe in their authority to enforce policy and consolidation initiatives;" and
6	WHEREAS, Finding No. 31 states: "There are no severe or immediate consequences
7	resulting from City departments failing to abide by agreements to implement citywide
8	initiatives or meet established timelines for completion;" and
9	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 2 states: "The Budget Analyst or the Controller
10	perform a management audit evaluating the Department of Technology's functions to
11	determine if the Department adequately communicates with other departments, and how to
12	alleviate the Department's barriers to better performance;" and
13	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 4 states: "COIT appoint two non-voting, non-City
14	employee members to sit on COIT without further delay;" and
15	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 5 states: "The City CIO develop consolidated
16	citywide comprehensive ICT budget and staffing plans, reviewed and approved by COIT, and
17	take the lead in its presentation to the Mayor's Budget Office and the Board of Supervisors;"
18	and
19	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 6 states: "Subsequent to COIT approval of the
20	ICT budget and staffing plans, COIT and the City CIO monitor adherence to these plans;" and
21	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 7 states: "The City CIO position be elevated in
22	authority, responsibility, and accountability by creating functional "dotted-line" relationships
23	between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs;" and
24	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 8 states: "Provide staff support to both the City
25	CIO and COIT;" and

1	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 9 states: "Amend Administrative Code, Section
2	22A.4 and 22A.7, to separate the position of City CIO from the Department of Technology;"
3	and
4	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 10 states: "Amend Administrative Code,
5	Sections 22A.4 and 22A.7, to create the separate position of Director of DT, appointed by and
6	reporting to the City CIO;" and
7	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 11 states: "The City CIO work with the
8	Controller to conduct a survey, including, but not limited to, performance data, client
9	satisfaction, decision-making and evaluation criteria, inventory of services, and needs
10	assessment, first for baseline figures and then annually to measure improvement over the
11	baseline figures;" and
12	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 12 states: "The City CIO report annually on the
13	state of technology in the City to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors;" and
14	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 13 states: "The City CIO and the Controller
15	create a citywide asset management system for ICT equipment;" and
16	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 14 states: "The City CIO and DHR create a
17	citywide skills database for personnel, to catalog such skills as programming languages, web
18	development, database, networking, and operating systems;" and
19	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 15 states: "Revise the Charter so that all vacant
20	and new technology positions be classified as Group II exempt positions;" and
21	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 16 states: "The City CIO be involved, with
22	department heads, in hiring decisions for their highest level ICT personnel;" and
23	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 17 states: "The City CIO be included, with
24	department heads, in the performance review process of senior ICT personnel in all
25	departments;" and

1	WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 18 states: "Pending revision of the Charter, the
2	Mayor develop methods for speeding up the hiring process for ICT personnel;" and
3	WHEREAS, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of
4	Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
5	Court on Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,
6	23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 as well as Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,
7	12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; now, therefore,
8	be it
9	RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
10	Superior Court that it {agrees/disagrees} 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17,
11	18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, for reasons as follows;
12	and, be it
13	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it
14	{agrees/disagrees} Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18
15	for reasons as follows; and, be it
16	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the
17	implementation of accepted findings and the recommendation through his/her department
18	heads and through the development of the annual budget.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	