

Evaluation Criteria

This is intended to be a tool to fairly and systematically evaluate what the outcome should be for each public body. The criteria will lead to a set of recommendations:

- Keep
- Keep but align to template
- Consolidate
- Eliminate

The criteria are organized into topic areas:

- Legal requirements
- Activity:
 - Inactivity
 - Borderline Inactivity
- Overlap with Other Bodies
- Breadth of Focus
- Type-Specific Considerations

Evaluation Criteria Tables

Legal Requirements Goal is to assess if State/Federal government requires either the body itself or the functions of the body.			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
1a) Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Keep. Stop with assessment.	Go to 1c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workbook
1b) Does this body currently fulfill a function required by State or Federal law?	Go to 1c)	Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workbook
1c) Could either another body or City staff potentially fulfill this function?	Continue to next section. <i>Note that if we later choose to consolidate or eliminate, those functions would need to be reassigned.</i>	Keep. Stop with assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workbook

Activity			
Determines if the body is active, inactive, or borderline inactive.			
Inactivity			
Goal is to determine if this body is inactive			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
2a) Has the body met at least once in the past year? (exception for periodic meeting bodies).	Continue to 2b	Body does not meet our definition of inactive. Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook
2b) Does the department provide a clear rationale for keeping this body, or are there any other relevant considerations for deferring decision-making on this body?	Continue with to next section.	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department engagement
Borderline Inactivity			
Goal is to assess at its most basic level if the body is actively working to meet their mandate			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
3a) Did the body meet fewer than 4 times in the past year and/or are more than 25% of seats vacant?	Investigate why, continue to 3b.	Body is not borderline inactive. Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook Department engagement
3b) Could these vacancy issues be addressed by applying templates to this body? (E.g., templates may reduce the number of seats).	Consider keeping but aligning to template. Continue to next section.	Consider consolidation or elimination. Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff analysis

Overlap and Duplicative Work

Goal is to assess if multiple bodies cover similar topics or policy areas and whether or not they could reasonably be combined.

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
4a) Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Go to 4b	Body is unique in policy area. Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook
4b) Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Consider consolidation or elimination	Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook Department engagement

Breadth of Focus

Goal is to assess if the commission is serving broader City interests, or if it is serving the interests of one specific group or population.

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
5a) Is the body related to one specific funding source, neighborhood, age/demographic group, or narrow policy topic?	Consider consolidation or elimination; continue to 5b	Continue to next section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook Staff analysis
5b) Was the group established to combat historic inequities, such as neighborhood disinvestment or discrimination?	Consider keeping. Continue to 5c	Continue to 5c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff analysis
5c) Could these interests be adequately represented by City staff or other public bodies with a broader scope and mandate?	Consider consolidation or elimination. Continue to next section.	Consider keeping, if functions are needed. Continue to next section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workbook Staff analysis

Definition

- Narrow policy topic:
 - Topic area or policy area that impacts a minority of San Francisco residents and does not directly impact the health, housing, or financial security of San Franciscans.

Type-Specific Considerations

These are considerations rather than criteria. This means staff will use these questions to inform final recommendations for specific bodies when other criteria point to eliminating or consolidating the body, but will not systematically answer them for each body. This is because each of these questions are important for understanding whether the body adds value that the evaluation criteria does not adequately capture, but do not need to be answered for bodies that we are otherwise keeping.

Advisory Committees Only Considerations

- 1) Based on a review of available information, are there other active pathways for public input regarding this policy area? If not, consider keeping the body.
- 2) According to a review of available information and relevant department input, does this body bring in outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from the City's work on the body's target topic area? This means that neither City staff nor other active forms of public engagement bring in this outside expertise. If not, continue with recommendation to consolidate or eliminate the body.

Staff Working Groups Considerations

- 3) Do staff or departments see any additional value in ensuring this body is in charter or code?