

1 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City
2 Technology Needs a Culture Shock]

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 and 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 partially disagrees with Finding 1 for reasons as follows: While the
11 participation of the Mayor's Budget Director has been helpful, departments have not received
12 a clear sense of priority or direction without the direct participation of the Mayor, and while
13 monthly participation by the Mayor is probably not feasible, a stronger sense of priority and
14 direction is needed to move forward with the city's technology agenda; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
16 disagrees with Finding 2 for reasons as follows: While the Department of Technology has
17 been viewed as competent and professional for some functions and some departments, there
18 are other departments have stated that the Department of Technology does not provide
19 satisfactory services as often as desired; and, be it

20 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it disagrees with
21 Finding 3 for reasons as follows: The recent cuts to the Department of Technology's budget
22 have been the result of budget deficits, not because of the Department of Technology's lack of
23 performance; and, be it

24 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
25 Finding 4; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
2 disagrees with Finding 5 for reasons as follows: While COIT policies and citywide
3 consolidated initiatives are communicated clearly, there is no follow-up, deadlines, or
4 accountability to carrying out such policies and initiatives; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
6 disagrees with Finding 6 for reasons as follows: COIT needs to prioritize selecting these two
7 non-voting, non-City employee members; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
9 disagrees with Finding 7 for reasons as follows: While the City's CIO has some powers, the
10 decentralized organizational structure makes it difficult for the CIO to enforce COIT standards
11 across the departments; and, be it

12 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
13 disagrees with Finding 8 for reasons as follows: While there are definite needs for an
14 externally-focused City CIO and an internally-focused the Department of Technology Director,
15 the Department of Technology Deputy could also assist in internal operations; and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
17 disagrees with Finding 9 for reasons as follows: While there is no formal forum to
18 communicate, there are informal channels, and some CIOs meet in COIT committees and
19 subcommittees, however, consolidation efforts would be assisted if there were more formal
20 channels for the CIOs to interact with each other and with the city CIO, and for accountability
21 measures to be instituted; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
23 disagrees with Finding 10 for reasons as follows: The City's inability to manage
24 interdepartmental IT projects and to centralize functions could benefit from a functional
25 reporting relationship between the City's CIO and departmental CIOs; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
2 Finding 11; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
4 Finding 12; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
6 disagrees with Finding 13 for reasons as follows: While there are some efforts to plan for
7 citywide ICT spending, there is no accountability and it's not clear who's responsible for such
8 citywide spending decisions; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
10 Finding 14; and, be it

11 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
12 Finding 15; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
14 Finding 16; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
16 Finding 17; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
18 Finding 18; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
20 Finding 19; and, be it

21 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
22 disagrees with Finding 20 for reasons as follows: While there are some efforts to gather data
23 to track how ICT currently functions, departments do not have good incentives to assist in
24 such data-gathering efforts; and, be it
25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
2 Finding 21; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
4 Finding 22; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
6 disagrees with Finding 23 for reasons as follows: City government needs to contemplate
7 faster and less cumbersome mechanisms beyond the current system, with feedback from
8 labor partners; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
10 disagrees with Finding 24 for reasons as follows: City government needs to contemplate
11 mechanisms beyond the current system to hire the best ICT staff, in consultation with labor
12 partners; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
14 disagrees with Finding 25 for reasons as follows: While few would admit that their individual
15 departmental needs ought to trump citywide concerns, lack of faith in the Department of
16 Technology and bureaucratic turf has created a city technology culture that does not promote
17 cross-departmental cooperation and the elimination of duplicative functions; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
19 disagrees with Finding 26 for reasons as follows: Over the past few years, there has been
20 some improvement in cooperation among departments, but there's still a good distance to
21 achieve; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
23 Finding 27; and, be it

24 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
25 Finding 28; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
2 Finding 29; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially
4 disagrees with Finding 30 for reasons as follows: While COIT would like to behave as if it has
5 the authority to enforce policy and consolidation initiatives, since COIT itself is such a diffuse
6 body, there is no one to hold departments or consolidation efforts accountable; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with
8 Finding 31; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 2
10 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: The Board acknowledges that a management
11 audit of the Department of Technology would be helpful, and this could be done either by the
12 Budget Analyst or the Controller; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 4
14 will be implemented within three months; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 5
16 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 6
18 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
20 analysis for Recommendation 7 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
21 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, COIT and the Department of
22 Technology return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

23 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 8
24 has been implemented; and, be it
25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
2 analysis for Recommendation 9 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
3 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology
4 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
6 analysis for Recommendation 10 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
7 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology
8 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
10 analysis for Recommendation 10 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
11 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO return to the Board
12 with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
14 12 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
16 13 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
18 analysis for Recommendation 14 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
19 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO and DHR, with
20 input from labor and department heads, return to the Board with an evaluation of potential
21 options; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
23 analysis for Recommendation 15 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
24 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology
25 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
2 16 has been implemented; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further
4 analysis for Recommendation 17 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the
5 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO return to the Board
6 with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
8 18 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the
10 implementation of accepted findings and the recommendation through his/her department
11 heads and through the development of the annual budget.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 120840

Date Passed: November 06, 2012

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury report entitled "Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

October 29, 2012 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

October 29, 2012 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED

November 06, 2012 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Elsbernd, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Olague and Wiener

File No. 120840

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 11/6/2012 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Mayor

Date Approved

Date: November 16, 2012

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

File No.
120840