Commission Streamlining Task Force

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Evaluation Criteria

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

- Keep
- Keep but align to template
- Combine
- 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**
1a) Does state or federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Keep	Go to 1b)
1b) Does this body currently fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	Go to 1c)	Continue to next section
1c) Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	Consider consolidating or eliminating. Continue to next section. *Note that if the Task Force later chooses to combine or eliminate, those functions would need to be reassigned.*	Keep

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**
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.
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
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**
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.
3b) Could these 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 combining or eliminating. Continue to next section.

Overlap With Other Bodies 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**
4a) Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Go to 4b	Body is unique in policy area. Continue to next section.
4b) Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Consider combining or eliminating	Continue to 4c
4c) Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Consider keeping and expanding scope	Continue to next section

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**
5a) Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Continue to 5b	Finish evaluation
5b) Could these interests be adequately represented by City staff or other public bodies with a broader scope and mandate?	Consider eliminating	Consider keeping
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.		

If the answer is "no" to all criteria, consider keeping the body.

Type-Specific Considerations

These are considerations rather than criteria. This means that these will not inform the criteria-based outcome, however, staff will use these questions to inform analysis of specific bodies when other criteria point to eliminating or combining the body. Staff will not systematically answer these questions for each body. 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 the criteria otherwise recommend 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 combine 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?