



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeff Kositsky, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

CC: Mayor's Budget Office

FROM: Peg Stevenson, Office of the Controller
Emily Lisker, Office of the Controller
Kyra Sikora, Office of the Controller
Glynis Startz, Office of the Controller

DATE: May 17, 2019

SUBJECT: **Staffing Analysis and Benchmarking for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) was formed in 2016, bringing together services and functions which had been provided in Public Health, Human Services, and other City agencies. Given the critical urgency of homelessness in San Francisco, the Department faces a high level of public pressure to stabilize and expand services quickly. As a new Department, HSH faces the challenges of developing infrastructure, policies and procedures, and a stable workforce. In addition, as new initiatives are added, such as opening new shelter beds, the City needs to consider the impact on staffing needs at all levels. In anticipation of the FY19-20 planning and budget process, City Performance conducted data analysis and interviews to evaluate whether several key departmental functions are staffed and structured appropriately so that HSH can achieve its mandates.

We compared HSH to other City functions and have determined that HSH lacks sufficient staffing in key areas. Our conclusions include:

- HSH's current external and public affairs staffing is insufficient given the level of engagement that is required with leadership, the community, and stakeholders. Homelessness service questions, response to public complaints, and shelter siting are just three examples of issues that require high levels of analysis, discussion, and attention from HSH management and subject matter experts. The department needs more staff who can perform these functions.

- Similarly, the data & performance team at HSH must respond to high levels of internal and external data requests, carry out strategic and performance planning, and work with the department's new data system to provide reports and analytical insights. Increased data and performance staffing would have a positive impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the department and help HSH with responding to stakeholders and the public.
- City departments typically struggle with rightsizing their contracting functions and staffing as the amount and variety of funding flowing through them increases. The contracts that HSH took over from other City agencies, and new procurements, range in size, type, and complexity. Moving beyond the basic management functions of contract set-up, payment of invoices, and ensuring compliance would likely require additional resources.
- Human Resources staff in HSH have been challenged by vacancies and a high rate of turnover in the department. There is a high number of unique classifications in HSH's workforce that require separate and specialized hiring processes. The Human Resources unit would benefit from additional staffing to manage and improve the department's hiring and retention. The vacancy rate in HSH affects its ability to deliver services across the department.
- Program support analysts in HSH (Class 2917), who manage the contracted programs and services and serve as the public-facing owner, have been overburdened as the department's set of contracts has increased. They manage more contracts than the comparable positions that existed in HSA before the creation of the department. While responsible for fewer contracts, they oversee larger program budgets than their counterparts at DCYF. Depending on the main driver of work for this position, this may indicate a need for additional resources.
- In budget and finance HSH is within the normal range of staffing that is indicated by our high-level benchmarking to other departments. More detailed study of budget, finance, accounting and related functions would allow for better comparison in these areas. The department has recently made new hires in information technology classifications that will bring it nearer to the normal range in basic infrastructure (email, network support), while gaps remain in appropriate staffing of the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) system and information security and privacy.

BACKGROUND

Since August 2016 when the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF or the City) first launched the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), the department has made significant efforts to unify staff, programs, and resources from multiple agencies; develop a new strategy for addressing homelessness; improve the organizational structure; and build a new data system for all homeless clients and services. The department's high-level goals include creating a coordinated homelessness response system, implementing performance accountability, reducing chronic and youth homelessness, ending family homelessness, and improving the City's response to street homelessness.

The work required to establish a new department is significant, especially for one facing the social emergency and logistical challenge that is homelessness. HSH leadership is concerned that the department's core administrative functions and program management may not have appropriate staffing to conduct the work efficiently and effectively. As examples, HSH has struggled to execute its contracts in a timely manner and has experienced a high turnover rate of staff in many functional areas—these problems can be attributed in part to organizational issues and gaps in HSH's structure. The Department just recently added facilities and IT functions, and has yet to move into their own offices.

HSH asked the Controller's Office to conduct a staffing analysis to assess whether the following departmental functions are staffed and structured to meet the department's needs and strategic goals:

- Contracting,
- Information Technology (IT),
- Human Resources (HR),
- Budget and finance,
- External affairs and public reporting,
- Program support analyst, and
- Data and performance.

METHODOLOGY

City Performance compared the size, structure, and workload of each of these functions to relevant benchmarks within CCSF. For each area, City Performance used existing data sources where possible, such as departmental administrative data, data from the Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, citywide hiring data from the People and Pay System, and prior benchmarking and review of HSH's organizational structure. City Performance interviewed a total of 25 staff from HSH and from the nine departments listed below during March and April 2019. See Appendix A for a list of staff interviewed by department and functional area.

- Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS)
- Department of Children, Youth and their Families (DCYF)
- Department of Public Health (DPH)
- Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Human Services Agency (HSA)
- Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
- Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)
- Port of San Francisco (PRT)
- San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)

See Appendix B for a more detailed list of data sources and Appendix C for departmental staffing and budgets.

FUNCTIONAL AREA BENCHMARKING

1. Contracting

HSH provided more than \$165 million in contracts to 48 nonprofit organizations in fiscal year 2017-2018 (FY18).¹ As in other CCSF social service departments, nonprofit organizations deliver a range of programs and services covering housing, shelter, health, workforce, and other social services. HSH's contracting unit is involved in all phases of contract development through execution, monitoring, and engaging closely with the program support analysts (described in more detail below). HSH was created with contracting staff from multiple departments and is still working to develop the infrastructure, policies, and procedures needed to operate effectively. The unit faces challenges with timely execution of contracts and invoice approval, exacerbated by a rapid growth in funding. In addition, contracts staff grapple with managing frequent budget negotiations with nonprofit providers and managing a significant number of funding sources with varying reporting requirements. Vacancies and turnover within the unit have affected its ability to manage its workload overall.

A comparison of staffing and workload across departments is confounded by variation in contract and grant complexity and by differences in contract term length and renewal timeframes. Our analysis looked at rough measures of contract management to gauge level of effort, workload, and complexity.

Using these benchmarks, we found HSH is near the middle in terms of value paid to nonprofit vendors in FY18, but on the low end of the number of contracts and vendors managed per staff analyst. In FY18, HSH had 12 contracts valued at over \$10 million, on par with DPH and HSA, but considerably higher than DCYF. HSH also had a higher number of nonprofit contracts valued over \$1 million than HSA, but comparable to that of DCYF.²

¹ Information provided by HSH. Payment amounts include \$125 million in General Fund money and over \$40 million in federal grant pass-throughs. In FY18, HSH also had agreements with eight organizations that were not nonprofits. HSH currently has agreements with 59 organizations, including 51 nonprofits.

² "Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, FY17-18 data."

Figure 1.
Contracting Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure	HSH	DCYF	DPH ³	HSA
Value paid to nonprofit vendors (\$M) ⁴	\$127.2	\$63.1	\$331.6	\$211.6
Contracts over \$10M ⁵	12 ⁶	2	13	11
Contracts over \$1M	147	151	Not available	96
Contract analysts ⁷	7	3	14	11
Nonprofit contracts ⁸ per analyst	23.6	122.7 ⁹	28.4	27.4
Nonprofit vendors ¹⁰ per analyst	6.9	45.0	7.0	10.3
Value paid to nonprofit vendors per analyst (\$M) ¹¹	\$18.2	\$21.0	\$23.7	\$19.2

Division of labor in contracting is fairly consistent across departments.

- There is general consistency among the benchmark departments about the role of contract analysts. They work in all aspects of the function—contract development, negotiation, approval, and management processes.
- All departments follow a roughly similar breakdown of expertise. Each department has a contract unit and a program unit. In most cases, the program units have responsibility for scope development and for monitoring service levels and service quality, while contracts staff are the “guardians of the procurement process” and conduct fiscal and compliance monitoring.
- Some contract units may be more involved in scope development (such as the Community Programs contracting unit within DPH), but that is generally due not to organizational design, but to individual experience and tradition.

³ The DPH comparison is restricted to Behavioral Health Services and Community Programs, excluding the unit that provides support to hospitals and for major IT contracts. This is likely to provide a cleaner comparison. In addition, DPH has two units (CDTA and BOCC) which perform some functions other departments perform within their Contract units.

⁴ Supplier Payment Report FY18, downloaded from SFOpenBook. This may not include federal pass-through funding.

⁵ Interviews and department contracting spreadsheets.

⁶ HSH has an additional contract over \$10M that is held by DPH.

⁷ As of March 2019, departmental organizational charts and interviews. This count excludes the top manager from each department but includes any unit level managers.

⁸ “Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, FY17-18 data”, organizational charts, and interviews.

⁹ The bulk of DCYF’s contracting work is on a five-year cycle and most grants are created with a five-year term. In off years the department estimated approximately 120 grant processing activities (new grants, add-backs, continuations and one-off grants, and amendments). In four of five years, the ratio of grants to analysts is similar to comparison departments.

¹⁰ Number of vendors is from “Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, FY17-18 data” and department-provided information. The number of contract analysts comes from organizational charts and interviews.

¹¹ Supplier Payment Report FY18, downloaded from SFOpenBook.

HSH staff may take on more responsibility for contractors' invoices and program review.

- Departments divide responsibility for invoice review and analysis primarily among contract analysts, program analysts, and budget and finance units. There are two main tasks—the review of invoices as they are submitted by vendors, and longer-term fiscal and compliance monitoring.
- HSH's contract analysts are responsible for individual invoice review for every vendor and contract. In addition, they perform overarching fiscal analysis, and tasks such as making monthly projections for contractors based on submitted invoices.
- In contrast to HSH, the Human Services Agency's (HSA) contracting unit does not have primary responsibility for reviewing every invoice. To align with best practices, the department recently reassigned that work to program analysts. Program analysts ensure billed services conform to the scope of work that they developed. The contract unit, and in some cases the finance office, continues to do review of invoices for compliance or fiscal purposes.
- Like HSA, DCYF similarly places standard review of invoices on program specialists while contract analysts perform annual fiscal monitoring and verification of invoices for services over the year.
- DPH reported that their accounting unit is responsible for review and payment of invoices rather than their contracting units.¹² A separate unit, the Business Office of Contract Compliance (BOCC), uses the fiscal monitoring process to review invoice documentation for the contractors that are in a citywide joint monitoring pool.

2. Information Technology

When HSH was created, many of its information technology systems were brought over from the Human Services Agency. HSH is now in the process of separating its systems from those of HSA and aims to complete this changeover by June of 2019. The department is also in the middle of implementing a new major system—the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System, which will provide assessments, case management, shelter bed reservation, and housing inventory management. The ONE System is designed to become a single, easy to use, system of record for all clients and families.¹³

The department believes the budgeted staffing of six FTE in their IT unit is insufficient given their projected system growth and reporting demands. HSH requires everyday support of a small department's needs for hardware, software, email, network access, and other functionality. This is combined with the implementation, training, and maintenance of a new large system that has multiple users, complex design elements, and high requirements for privacy and access control. As a human services agency working with protected and sensitive personal information, HSH is also cognizant of the

¹² DPH recently reported that contract analysts may increase their role in invoice review (e.g., to help identify and resolve payment issues) via more frequent and regular engagement with the department's accounting unit.

¹³ For more detailed information on the future functionality of the ONE System, see the COIT Budget & Performance Subcommittee Regular Meeting Documentation. March 15, 2019.

need for proactive data privacy and security policies and procedures. HSH is taking on increasingly complex care coordination activities that require collaboration and data sharing across departments and may not have adequate staffing to assume these responsibilities.

Our analysis looked at the total number of staff in the 1000 series information technology classifications in certain benchmark departments (see Appendix D). We also looked at how a couple of systems that have comparable design elements and uses to ONE are staffed. Overall, HSH falls near the bottom of total budgeted departmental staff per budgeted IT staff to support their departmental functions. For the ONE System, the department has significantly lower budgeted levels of staffing with just one dedicated FTE compared to systems such as Coordinated Case Management (CCMS) at DPH and the housing portal at MOHCD known as DAHLIA.

Figure 2.
IT Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure	HSH ¹⁴	DCYF	DPH	DPW	HSA	MOHCD ¹⁵
IT staff in the 1000 series classifications (actual) ¹⁶	0.9 ¹⁷	2	222.1	34.1	62.4	6
IT staff in the 1000 series classifications (budgeted)	3.6	2	259	48.8	74	5
Department FTE per IT staff (1000 series) (actual)	111.6	24.1	30.6	39.8	37.8	14.9
Department FTE per IT staff (1000 series) (budgeted)	34.6	29.6	29.7	34.5	31.6	19.3
IT system comparison	ONE	not available	CCMS	CMMS	not available	DAHLIA
Staff for selected system ¹⁸	1	not available	5	7	not available	4
Cases in system	50,000 ¹⁹	not available	460,000 ²⁰	not applicable	not available	41,270 ²¹
FY19 budget allocations: IT infrastructure (\$1000s) ²²	\$217	\$99	\$12,902	\$3,998	\$3,927	not available
Departmental FTE (budgeted)	124.6	59.2	7,691.8	1,685.3	2,339.8	not available
IT infrastructure per FTE (budgeted)	\$1,745	\$1,674	\$1,677	\$2,372	\$1,679	not available

¹⁴ As of FY20, HSH anticipates five budgeted positions in the 1000s classifications in addition to an IT manager, all but one of which is expected to be staffed.

¹⁵ MOHCD has four FTE staff from DT funded by MOHCD who work on the DAHLIA system included in this table.

¹⁶ Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18. Also used for budgeted IT staff, actual FTE per IT staff, and budgeted FTE per IT staff.

¹⁷ HSH staffing is now higher than this as the open positions from FY18 have been filled.

¹⁸ Current staffing as reported through interviews or validated organizational charts.

¹⁹ As of March 15, 2019 COIT Budget & Performance Subcommittee Regular Meeting Documentation.

²⁰ Includes "Bio-psycho-social integrated histories from 15 databases" CCMS Whole Person Care User Guide. <https://sf-wpc-ccms.gitbook.io/ccms-user-guide>.

²¹ In FY18, 41,270 households applied for MOHCD-sponsored rental housing through DAHLIA. MOHCD projects 600,000 online applications between FY17 and FY20. Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development. 2016-2020 Strategic Plan. <https://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOHCD%20Strategic%20Plan%202016-2020.pdf>.

²² "Appendix C – FY 2018-19 Annual Budget Allocations by Department." Service Level Agreement FY 18-19. San Francisco Department of Technology. See Appendix B of the SLA for more detail on service categories. https://sfgov1.sharepoint.com/sites/TIS/Collaborations/ServiceCatalog/Shared%20Documents/DT_SLA_FY_18-19_ver_7-27-2018%20FINAL.pdf.

Smaller departments rely heavily on DT for standard IT functions, but departments all use centralized resources such as Microsoft 365 applications or email.

- Most departments rely on DT for some central functions including Microsoft licensing and applications, email, and network support.
- Larger departments like DPH, HSA, and DPW provide their own system support and have a level of core staffing for standard desktop functions. Smaller departments use DT for these support functions.
- DT sets budget allocations for IT infrastructure support using the department's size and other metrics (such as the service or database complexity, actual data usage, etc.) Comparing DT's FY19 allocations, HSH is near the middle among agency benchmarks. Their budget for IT infrastructure per FTE is less than that of DPW but very close to that of other human and social service agencies.

High levels of sensitive data require significantly more resources for IT privacy and security.

- In our interviews benchmark departments that deal with significant amounts of protected health information (PHI), i.e., HSH, HSA, MOHCD, and DPH, all shared similar concerns on workload related to data privacy and security. Data privacy and security is an area of risk for HSH given their collection and usage of protected and sensitive personal information.
- The larger benchmark departments such as HSA and DPH have full-time positions responsible for dealing with data privacy, and they plan to grow these functions to keep up with the rising demand for improved governance, policy, and compliance.
- Proactively addressing data privacy and security is a concern across the City. A current analysis by City Performance outlines the need for a Chief Privacy Officer for the entire city, partly to satisfy regulatory requirements under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), and to oversee and coordinate the efforts of the privacy specialists in each department. HSH believes that the number of internal staff and contracted providers working with PHI and level of risk necessitates a department-specific role.

Departments standing up or supporting new IT systems all felt they had insufficient staffing.

- Departments that are building or augmenting new core technology typically rely on outside IT consultants to construct and stand up the systems, and on an as-needed basis to provide updates and technical support. Both DPW and MOHCD used outside vendors to stand up their core IT systems. Once the systems were functional, they kept those resources on retainer for modifications, updates, and highly technical maintenance tasks.
- Since 2009, DPW has paid consultants approximately \$4.4 million for software and \$2.2 million for support of its Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS).
- MOHCD paid approximately \$250,000 annually for a Salesforce subscription and associated technology tools for DAHLIA, San Francisco's housing portal for residents to find City-

sponsored affordable housing.²³ MOHCD also funds four positions in the Digital Services group with the General Services Agency who do full-time work on DAHLIA.

- DPH supports its CCMS entirely internally in large part because of its age and design, which make it difficult to find external support. The original costs for the system were \$60,000 per year for Oracle licenses and the costs of staff time, which were significant—thousands of hours over time to build the system and integrate datasets. Similar to HSH's ONE System, CCMS merges information from multiple other data sources to provide a comprehensive assessment on individuals' medical, psychological, and social welfare, enabling DPH staff and nonprofit providers to view comprehensive client records in real time as well as aggregate data to better understand the client population needs and outcomes.
- Except for DPH, whose CCMS has been in maintenance mode for many years, no department feels adequately staffed for the core systems we reviewed. This is an area of risk for HSH as it builds out the ONE System and puts it into use for its staff, contractors, and performance reporting.

3. Human Resources

HSH provides human resources and payroll support to its 125 budgeted FTEs with a team of four employees, three analysts, and a payroll clerk. The department reported that the number of needed hiring processes, high turnover, and the high proportion of direct service staff—outreach, housing program, and case management staff—in the department has put a strain on the workload of that unit.

Figure 3.
Human Resources Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure	HSH	DCYF	DPH	DPW	HSA	MOHCD	PRT	SFPD
HR staff ²⁴	4	--	115	16 ²⁵	58	--	--	79
Actual departmental FTEs ²⁶	100.4	48.2	6,793.6	1,357.6	2,359	85.6	240.8	2,906.6
Budgeted departmental FTEs	124.6	59.2	7,691.8	1,685.3	2,399.8	92.4	314.1	3,136.9
Vacancy rate	19%	19%	12%	19%	2%	7%	23%	7%

²³ MOHCD reported that Salesforce is \$200,000 annually while other technology tools cost \$45,000-\$50,000 per year.

²⁴ As of March 2019, departmental organizational charts and interviews.

²⁵ Includes staff in hiring, payroll and appointment processing, and exams. Excludes labor relations as this unit also handles relations for other departments.

²⁶ Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18. Also used for budgeted FTEs, vacancy rate, unique classifications, and unique classifications per budgeted FTE.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

Measure (continued)	HSH	DCYF	DPH	DPW	HSA	MOHCD	PRT	SFPD
Unique classifications (budgeted)	43	25	256	165	125	19	112	82
Unique classifications per budgeted FTE	35%	42%	3%	10%	5%	21%	36%	3%
% of positions posted in FY18 currently filled ²⁷	25.5%	--	41.4%	59.6%	49.7%	--	--	57.3%
Median time to hire PCS (days) ²⁸	155	--	180	160	122	--	--	40
Median time to hire exempt and provisional appointments (days) ²⁹	89	--	119	48	57	--	--	10
Average turnover ³⁰	20.1%	--	10.1%	13.6%	23.3%	--	--	6.5%

HSH has an elevated hiring workload and high vacancy rate.

- Like other small to medium-sized benchmark departments (i.e., DCYF and Port), HSH hires a larger proportion of unique classifications than comparison departments. This increases the average workload for filling an open position.
- HSH has a median hire time of 155 days for permanent civil service (PCS) and 89 days for exempt/provisional appointments.³¹ The PCS appointment hire time falls near the middle of comparison departments, while the exempt/provisional appointment hire time is near the top, after DPH.
- HSH has a higher vacancy rate than most of the comparison departments which increases the workload and strains on existing staff. The vacancy rate has continued to grow—currently about one-third of positions are open, up from 19% in FY18.
- Finally, HSH's turnover rate is the second highest among the comparisons, but still below that of HSA.

²⁷ Time to Hire Report, People and Pay System, FY18. Also used for both median time to hire calculations.

²⁸ Calculated for all job postings approved during FY18.

²⁹ Calculated for all job postings approved during FY18.

³⁰ Staff by Pay Period End, People and Pay System, FY18.

³¹ In this memo, time to hire is defined as the period of time beginning when a department formally initiates the hiring process by submitting a Request to Fill form and ending when the employee starts work in their new position.

4. Budget and Finance

HSH's seven budget and finance staff manage the department's \$245 million budget which includes General Fund sources (78%) as well as federal and state grants. The department reported a higher workload than anticipated because of the increased reporting requirements due to a larger amount of special funding received. In addition, with just one budget analyst and one grants analyst, HSH's Budget and Finance manager and Deputy Director take on all budget responsibilities. A more in-depth review is needed to determine exactly how staffing levels of budget analysts alone compare to benchmark departments.

As a rough measure of workload, we note that HSH has a slightly higher ratio of funding to budget and finance staff than DCYF, a similarly sized department.³² We did not separate the administrative tasks, such as payroll and accounting, from the workload of analysts in budget and finance. Relative staffing for these roles may vary across department size. When comparing to HSA, which receives a similar proportion of funding from the General Fund, HSH has a significantly higher ratio of funding to budget and finance staff than HSA.

Figure 4.
Budget and Finance Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure	HSH	DCYF	DPH ³³	HSA
Budget and finance staff ³⁴	7	7	83	84
Departmental budget ³⁵	\$245M	\$210M	\$1,001M ³⁶	\$860M
% of budget from the General Fund	78%	19% ³⁷	88%	88%
Departmental budget per budget and finance staff ³⁸	\$35M	\$30M	\$12M	\$10M

³² While HSH and DCYF have similar budgets and staffing, their budget and finance functions may represent different workloads due to varying complexity and needs. Further analysis is needed to quantify the actual staffing needs.

³³ We restricted this to the budget and finance functions of DPH for Behavioral Health Services, Population Health, and Administration, excluding the separate units covering the two hospitals. We believe this is a more suitable comparison.

³⁴ As of March 2019, departmental organizational charts and interviews. This measure includes staff across budget and finance roles, such as budget and fiscal analysts, payroll clerks, and accountants.

³⁵ Budget. San Francisco Controller's Office. Downloaded from DataSF.

³⁶ DPH's budget was restricted to 1G, 2S, 3C, and 4D funds and excluded 5H and 5L (General Hospital and Laguna Honda) funds to match the budget as closely as possible to the relevant budget and finance units.

³⁷ The majority of DCYF's budget is funded through the Children's Fund.

³⁸ This does not reflect the actual amount each analyst is responsible for; we use it to standardize across departments.

Departments agreed that different funding sources require uneven levels of work.

- Departments reported that funding sources have different reporting requirements and complexity, which impact workload. For instance, DPH mentioned the distinction between the General Fund sources compared to operating revenues such as insurance payments and service fees, while HSA and HSH noted the complexity of managing federal and state grants in comparison to block funding.
- There was no clear agreement among departments on the effect of the number of different categories of funding and whether that is associated with workload. HSH hypothesized that a high number of different funding sources increased their workload. DCYF's experience is that different funding sources has less of an impact on workload than the sheer number of contractors and grantees.

Larger departments split budget and finance into different workgroups, smaller departments consolidate.

- Budget and finance units handle various types of responsibilities, such as budget analysis and fiscal projections. While these types of responsibilities are not clearly defined across departments to enable straightforward comparisons, it appears important for the overall efficiency with which a department uses and measures their spending.
- There is a clear distinction between larger departments (i.e., HSA and DPH) and smaller ones (i.e., DCYF and HSH). Larger ones not only separate budgeting and finance into their own teams, but also have units specific to programs like Medi-Cal and CalFresh that have specific requirements, such as for state cost reporting and cost allocation.

5. External Affairs and Public Reporting

In its first two years of ramping up as a stand-alone City department, HSH has faced a high level of demand from leadership, stakeholders, and the public for data, information, and in-person consultation. Public hearings and meetings, new program proposals, and a steady stream of new proposed shelter and housing sites, layered onto the day-to-day demand of providing housing services, case management, outreach, and other core services have caused significant organizational strains. HSH struggles with the high volume of community and information requests and the high frequency of executive and program coordination meetings within the City. The department feels it is critical to create a proactive communications plan in addition to remaining responsive to the community but has felt unable to do so with the current level of staffing. The department has three FTE external affairs positions budgeted, but turnover has meant it often functions with one to two staff.

The workload for external affairs is difficult to measure—all City departments rely on many people who work in roles outside of communications or media. Information requests and community or leadership consultative needs are not tracked in a comprehensive way.

Figure 5.
External Affairs Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure	HSH	DPW	PRT	SFPD
External affairs staff	2.5 ³⁹	16 ⁴⁰	4 ⁴¹	28 ⁴²
Requests for community events	35 ⁴³	25-33 ⁴⁴	not available	not available
Annual Sunshine Ordinance requests	260-520 ⁴⁵	833 ⁴⁶	90 ⁴⁷	184 ⁴⁸
Monthly Board of Supervisor Hearings	2-4 ⁴⁹	5-10 ⁵⁰	2-3 ⁵¹	3-4 ⁵²

HSH may have a high proportion of community requests and meetings given the department size.

- HSH has lower external and public affairs staffing levels than benchmark departments but a high volume of Sunshine Ordinance requests and requests to participate in Board of Supervisors hearings. Where there is a quantitative measure available—requests to attend community events—it appears that HSH has an approximately comparable workload to that of DPW but just one-sixth of the staffing.
- HSH estimated ten daily meetings and communications between department executives and City leadership, such as from the Mayor's Office or the Board of Supervisors.

³⁹ HSH reports two dedicated full-time staff, an administrative assistant at approximately 0.5 FTE., There is a limited term senior manager without ongoing funding. It is not included in the 2.5 FTE.

⁴⁰ DPW reports four Community Programs staff; five media, design, and event planning staff; six public affairs positions in construction outreach; and a partial FTE each responsible for Sunshine Requests and as Liaison to the BOS.

⁴¹ Current estimate of full-time staff from Port external affairs. Excludes other staff who also spent time on external work.

⁴² This number includes the staff of the Media Relations Unit and the Community Engagement Division, excluding HSOC Command Center and Street Operations.

⁴³ This is an estimated monthly minimum.

⁴⁴ This is based on an estimated 300-400 annual requests across the entire department (including HR recruiting events in the community, construction outreach, neighborhood meetings, tabling at Sunday Streets, etc.)

⁴⁵ This is an approximation based on information provided by HSH that estimated 5-10 requests per week.

⁴⁶ For calendar year 2018, as reported by DPW. It was a 10% increase over 2017.

⁴⁷ This is an approximation based on the Port's estimate of 5-10 Sunshine Ordinance requests per month.

⁴⁸ This is the number of Public Records Act (PRA) requests handled by the Media Relations Unit in 2017.

⁴⁹ This is an approximation based on information provided by HSH in April 2019. This does not include meetings or calls with the Board of Supervisors.

⁵⁰ This is an estimated monthly average of the number of times DPW testifies at BOS hearings, as provided by the department. An original estimate of 10-20 was based on a high volume period in Q3FY19 and included multiple permit modification hearings—a type of work that is unlikely to occur in other benchmarking departments. A further conversation with the department suggests that 5-10 may be a more accurate and comparable long-run estimate.

⁵¹ Does not include Port Commission meetings which may replace some BOS meetings for other departments.

⁵² According to SFPD, this does not include various data requests from the Board of Supervisors nor meetings with the Board and the Chief, Command Staff, Captains, or Chief Staff.

- SFPD reported between eight and 12 standard monthly meetings between the Chief of Police and the Mayor's Office, as well as occasional meetings for unanticipated incidents. SFPD noted that District Station Captains spend significant time on communications.
- DPW reported that department executives spend a significant portion of their time meeting with other department executives, the Mayor's Office, or executive staff. The DPW Director meets regularly with other department heads and the Mayor, convenes weekly meetings with an internal executive team, and has weekly one-on-one meetings with deputy directors.
- Multiple departments reported involvement in community relations and meetings from dedicated staff and from other programmatic or line staff. The Port also noted that other staff not specifically assigned to external affairs spend approximately 25-35% of their time on outreach.
- To support HSH's strategic goals, external affairs staff spend significant time engaging with philanthropists and outside partners. Benchmark departments did not think of this function as a measurable part of their external affairs work.

6. Program Support Analyst - Classification 2917

HSH relies heavily on the 2917 Program Support Analyst classification to manage the programs and services contracted out to community nonprofits. Each analyst both serves as a programmatic expert in their area and is responsible for vendor management and support. HSH has focused on recruiting experts for the role but has found it is consistently overloaded as the portfolio of the entire department has increased over the past few years. Ten analysts are currently managing a total portfolio of \$992 million dollars, averaging 22 contracts each. We interviewed department managers on their usage of the classification and observations in this area, but further analysis is needed to better assess the appropriate workload and duties for this role. Program support analysts at HSH are currently handling several more contracts than their counterparts did at HSA before the department was created. They are still responsible for fewer contracts than analysts at either DAAS or DCYF but handle a higher value per analyst. HSH notes that during this ramp up period analysts have been repeatedly asked to add new scope to contracts, requiring modification of budgets and terms. Information about the exact value of contracts per analyst may not be directly comparable as multiyear agreements can skew the amount reported.

Figure 6.
Program Support Analyst Measures of Staffing and Workload FY18.

Measure/Department	HSH	DAAS	DCYF ⁵³	HSA ⁵⁴
Actual FTEs ⁵⁵	10.2	8.9	15	8
Budgeted FTEs ⁵⁶	10	11	not available	10
Approximate # of contracts per analyst ⁵⁷	22	25-30	28	18
Approximate value of contracts per analyst	\$99.2M ⁵⁸	not available ⁵⁹	\$28.6M ⁶⁰	\$9.7M ⁶¹

Benchmark departments reported varying responsibilities for the 2917 position and equivalents.

- The 2917 position and its equivalents generally serve as the programmatic contract or grant owners, the program expert, and the public-facing owner of a program or set of programs. In addition to this position, there is a contract analyst (typically within the 1800 series) for handling the fiscal issues and terms and conditions.
- Multiple 2917 analysts in HSH are managers while at DAAS two 2917s manage a small number of positions.
- DPW has six budgeted 2917 positions within their operations division, and several are responsible for the management of department programs. These analysts have similar subject matter and programmatic expertise to their counterparts in other departments. However, their work primarily focuses on managing internal operations.
- DPW also has two budgeted 2917 positions who function mainly as managers for six Public Information Officers (PIOs). These positions are responsible for community outreach and response across the city.
- DCYF does not use the 2917 classification. The equivalent position in DCYF is the 9772 and 9774 classifications. DCYF expressed some interest in transitioning the 9772 and 9774 roles to the 1800 series.

⁵³ The number of analysts is based on the identified equivalent positions within DCYF (9772 and 9774) using the department's current organizational chart. It does not include a number of 9772 and 9774 positions which perform different duties.

⁵⁴ FY17 Homelessness Analysts. These are the 2917 positions that were transferred to HSH upon its creation.

⁵⁵ Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18.

⁵⁶ Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18.

⁵⁷ This number comes either from an estimation by the relevant department, or by calculation based on available departmental contracting spreadsheets. The same is true of the value of contracts per analyst.

⁵⁸ This includes multi-year contracted amounts.

⁵⁹ DAAS does not assign dollar amounts by analyst.

⁶⁰ This includes multi-year contracted amounts.

⁶¹ This is an annual contracted amount.

- HSH believes the work conducted by the current 2917 position may be better served by the creation of a new classification to differentiate it during the application process and attract more applicants with the desired skillset. At a minimum, HSH would like an intermediate step between the 2917 position and 0923 manager. HSH management reports that staff in both positions are often required to manage too many staff, and that the differential numbers of reports for 2917s can lead to very different workloads.

7. Data and Performance

HSH's Data and Performance unit of four staff aims to use data and best practices research to support the creation and ongoing implementation of high quality, responsive, and coordinated homeless services. The unit has focused on building performance accountability across the homelessness response system. The department is in the process of implementing several key performance accountability projects, including developing system-wide and program specific performance outcome measures and developing standard cost metrics for shelter beds. However, HSH's staff and analytical capacity have limited what HSH has been able to accomplish in two years.⁶²

HSH faces significant challenges in monitoring performance due to lack of historic data, inadequate data collection methods, and a lack of technology to better gather, track, and analyze data. It is working to improve consistency and rethink reporting tools but is limited by the necessity of complying with everyday information and analysis requests.⁶³ In addition, the unit struggles with basic performance measurement challenges (such as the manual, time-intensive, and error-prone process to clean and consolidate data from nonprofit providers), limiting the team's ability to tackle their larger strategic priorities.

Figure 7.
Data and Performance Measures of Staffing from Recent Organizational Charts.

Measure	HSH	DCYF	DPW	MTA
Data and performance staff ⁶⁴	3	7	7	15 ⁶⁵
Actual FTE (FY18) ⁶⁶	100.4	48.2	1,357.6	5,414.9
Department FTE per data staff (actuals)	33.5	6.9	193.9	361.0

⁶² Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Whitley, Gigi. Memo to: Jeff Kositsky dated November 15, 2018. HSH's Performance Accountability Initiatives.

⁶³ Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Locher, Sarah. Memo to: Jeff Kositsky dated August 30, 2018. Refining Reporting Measures in the RFP Process.

⁶⁴ As of March 2019, departmental organizational charts and interviews.

⁶⁵ This includes staff of three separate performance teams: Project Controls (capital projects) has five analysts and a manager, Strategic Planning and Initiatives has an analyst and a manager, and Performance and Business Support has five analysts and a manager. A Chief Performance Officer sits above those three teams.

⁶⁶ Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18.

Departments identified the same general streams of work for their data and performance teams.

- Benchmark comparisons are difficult to make in this function. There is a clear divide between the large departments and smaller ones but demand for data and performance work is not expected to track to department size.
- There is general agreement on and similarity of the data and performance teams' roles—they are responsible for developing and maintaining performance measures, both overall and for specific programs or contracts, across departments.
- All departments' performance units do data reporting both internally and externally, e.g., for contracts, the public, interdepartmental requests, and oversight bodies.
- DPW, MTA, and HSH performance teams additionally support strategic planning, performance management, and process improvement within their Data and Performance groups.
- The MTA has a third section of their performance team working specifically on capital projects.
- DCYF highlighted program evaluation, research, and policy analysis as major workstreams for their performance group.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Department Benchmarking Interviews

	Contact Name	Position	Functional Areas Covered
HSH	Gigi Whitley	Deputy Director, Administration & Finance	Contracting, IT, HR, Budget and Finance, Data and Performance
	Abigail Stewart-Kahn	Director, Strategic Initiatives	External Affairs and Public Reporting
	Kerry Abbott	Deputy Director, Programs	2917 Program Analyst
	Gilda Kemper ⁶⁷	Contracts Manager	2917 Program Analyst, Contracting
DAAS	Cindy Kauffman	Deputy Director of Community Services	2917 Program Analyst
DCYF	Laura Moyé	Deputy Director	Contracting, Budget and Finance, 2017 Program Analyst, Data and Performance
	Brett Conner	Grants Manager	Contracting
	Brandon Shou	Finance Manager	Budget and Finance
DPH	Mario Moreno	Director, Office of Contract Management & Compliance	Contracting
	Rupal Mehta	Whole Person Care Platform Supervisor	IT
	Jenny Louie	Budget Director	Budget and Finance, HR
DPW	Christine Nath	Project Manager, IT	IT
	Julia Dawson	Deputy Director, Financial Management and Administration	HR
	Tammy Wong	Senior Human Resources Manager	HR
	Rachel Gordon	Director of Policy and Communications	External Affairs and Public Reporting
	Alexandra Bidot	Performance Management Manager	Data and Performance
	Anne Jenkins	Principal Administrative Analyst	Data and Performance
	Donna D'Cruz	Assistant Manager – Central Operations	2917 Program Analyst
	Jeremy Spitz	Special Assistant for Government and Legislative Affairs	
HSA	Dan Kaplan	Deputy Director, Finance & Administration	Contracting, IT, HR, Budget and Finance, 2917 Program Analyst

⁶⁷ Provided requested metrics and qualitative insights electronically.

	Noelle Simmons ⁶⁸	Deputy Director, Economic Support and Self-Sufficiency	2917 Program Analyst
	Emily Gibbs ⁶⁹	Budget Manager	2917 Program Analyst
MOHCD	Brian Cheu	Director of Community Development	IT
MTA	Travis Fox	Chief Performance Officer	Data and Performance
PRT	Randy Quezada	Communications Director	External Affairs and Public Reporting
SFPD	Robert O'Sullivan	Commander, Administration Bureau	HR
	Deirdre Hussey	Director Policy and Public Affairs	External Affairs and Public Reporting
	David Stevenson	Director Strategic Communications	External Affairs and Public Reporting

Appendix B. Data Sources

Source	Functional Areas
Budget. San Francisco Controller's Office. From DataSF	Budget & Finance
Budget and Actuals Report, People and Pay System, FY18.	IT; HR; Program Support Analyst; Data & Performance
CCMS Whole Person Care User Guide.	IT
Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, FY18 data	Contracting
COIT Budget & Performance Subcommittee Regular Meeting Documentation. March 15, 2019.	IT
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Whitley, Gigi. Memo to: Jeff Kositsky. HSH's Performance Accountability Initiatives.	Data & Performance
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Locher, Sarah. Memo to: Jeff Kositsky. Refining Reporting Measures in the RFP Process.	Data & Performance
Department of Technology. Service Level Agreement FY 18-19.	IT
Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development. 2016-2020 Strategic Plan.	IT
Staff by Pay Period End, People and Pay System, FY18.	HR
Supplier Payment Report FY18, downloaded from SFOpenBook	Contracting
Time to Hire Report, People and Pay System, FY18.	HR

⁶⁸ Provided qualitative insights electronically.

⁶⁹ Provided requested metrics and qualitative insights electronically.

Appendix C. Departmental Size Comparisons

Measure	HSH	DAAS	DCYF	DPH	DPW	HSA	MOHCD	MTA	PRT	SFPD	SHF
Actual FTE	100.4	325.8	48.2	6793.6	1357.6	2359	85.6	5414.9	240.8	2906.6	1014.9
Budgeted FTE	124.6	369.6	59.2	7691.8	1685.3	2339.8	92.4	6223.8	314.1	3136.9	1160
Total Budget (\$M)	245	n/a	210	2153	268	860	n/a	1181	128	580	209

Appendix D. IT Staffing, 1000 Series Job Classifications

Class	HSH		DCYF		DPH		DPW		HSA		MOHCD	
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
1003												
1010					20	6.9						
1031									1	1		
1032									1	1		
1041					6	5.8				.4		
1042					9	11.7	3	3.7	3	3		
1043	1	0			18	14.8			5	4.5		
1044					15	14.8	3	3	3	2.9		
1051					4	4.4	2	1.3	2	1		
1052			1	1	20	18.9	2	1.1	5	2.1		
1053	.8	.9			31	26.3	10	5.5	16	11.9	1	2.4
1054			1	1	44	38.5	10.8	5.8	5	5		
1062									1	1.6		
1063					6	4.1	1	3	4	3.1		
1064					4	3.3			4	2		
1070	1	0			16	15.1	6	3	2	2		
1091					4	7.8	1	1.3	3	1.4		
1092	.8				20	17.7	2	1.4	9	11.3		
1093	1	0			30	25.9	4	3.2	6	3.4		
1094					7	5.1	3	.8	3	3.8		
1095					5	1	1	1	1	1		
Total	4	1	2	2	259	222	49	34	74	62	1	2