



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

**Ben Rosenfield**  
**Controller**

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

July 28, 2017

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

Dear Judge Jackson:

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ben Rosenfield  
Controller

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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