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Objectives of this document

• Provide a fact base to inform C/DOSW’s strategy development

• Share emerging recommendations and strategic options for discussion with C/DOSW at the October 23rd meeting

Note: the strategic planning process is not yet complete; this document is a working draft of the analysis, subject to revision as the research progresses
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Interviews
(23 1:1s and 2 focus groups)

• COSW Commissioners
  – Breanna Zwart
  – Dr. Shokooh Miry
  – Andrea Shorter
  – Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz
  – Debbie Mesloh
  – Julie D. Soo

• DOSW Staff
  – Emily Murase
  – Carol Sacco
  – Elise Hansell
  – Elizabeth Newman
  – Herschell Larrick
  – Kyoko Peterson
  – Natalie Alvarez

• External Experts
  – Beverly Upton, SF Domestic Violence Consortium
  – Carolyn Wang Kong, Blue Shield Foundation
  – Kimberly Churches, AAUW
  – Molly Whelan, Friends of the CSW
  – Protima Pandey, Santa Clara Office of Women’s Policy
  – Surina Khan, Women’s Foundation of California
  – Sheryl Davis, Human Rights Commission, SF
  – Tania Del Rio, Boston Mayor’s Office of Women’s Advancement

Data analysis

• DOSW Data, e.g.,
  – City and County of San Francisco Mayor’s Budget Book(s) 2011-2019
  – San Francisco Performance Results FY 2017-2018

• Other Data, e.g.,
  – California Office of Emergency Services Grants Database 2019
  – Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) Grants Program Database

Literature review

• DOSW Reports, e.g.,
  – Commission and Department on Status of Women Annual Report (FY 2016-2017)
  – Family Violence Reports 2016-2019
  – Gender Analysis of City Operations (Commissions & Boards etc)

• Other Reports, e.g.,
  – California Victim Compensation Board Annual Report 2017-2018
  – California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services Joint Legislative Budget Committee Report

• VAW Grantee Focus Groups
  – Clementine Ntshaykolo, SF Safe House
  – Denny David, LYRIC
  – Emberly Cross, CROC
  – Farmmary Saephan, APA FSF
  – Gloria Dominguez, Mission Girls
  – Julia Parish, Legal Aid at Work
  – Kara Duggan, La Casa
  – Kelsey Friedman, JFCS
  – Maria Jimenez, Mujeras Unidas y Activas
  – Mary Martinez, WOMAN Inc.
  – Nicole Santamaria, El/La Para Trans Latinas
  – Orchid Pusey, Asian Women’s Shelter
  – Saerom Choi, API Legal Outreach

• Other Reports, e.g.,
  – California Victim Compensation Board Annual Report 2017-2018
  – California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services Joint Legislative Budget Committee Report
Executive Summary

Introduction and Context

- The San Francisco (SF) Commission and Department on the Status of Women (C/DOSW) both originated when women in San Francisco organized for greater equality and representation.
- Since its inception, the C/DOSW has contributed to several key achievements for gender equality in SF, e.g., deaths relating to domestic violence fell to zero for 44 continuous months in the early 2010s.
- **Today, C/DOSW are facing an imperative for change.** Women’s key needs are changing in parallel to demographic and economic shifts in our city, e.g., SF is now the most income-unequal city in America. Commissioners’ aspirations and expertise point to a range of potential responses to these shifts. At the same time, staff feel under-resourced to adequately address existing priorities.
- **Any new or refined strategy must align with the C/DOSW mandates, i.e.,**
  - to implement the principles of CEDAW (advance gender equality with a human rights lens)
  - to monitor the status of women and girls (in the city government and for SF as a whole), including reporting on specific issues such as depiction of women and girls on city property
  - to monitor, address and reduce family violence in SF via the Family Violence Council

DOSW’s Current Portfolio

- **Today, the C/DOSW primarily works to reduce violence against women and increase workplace equity. It does so via five functions** - (i) increasing access to services (via grant making or coordination and implementation of private, state, and federal grants), (ii) strengthening the gender lens in the city government’s activities via, e.g., policy advocacy (iii) generating and disseminating data-driven insights (iv) field building and community engagement, and (v) administrative activities.

- **DOSW staff split their time somewhat equally among these five functions (~20-25%), with the exception of field-building and community engagement (~8%).** Particularly time-intensive activities are research (~20%) and administration, accounting and financial oversight (~25%)
Executive Summary

• The vast majority (>80%) of DOSW’s $9.4 million budget* is disbursed as direct grants via the Violence Against Women Prevention and Intervention Grants Program. This program provides between $50,000 to $600,000 in funding to 28 grantees, comprising an average of ~10% of total grantees organizational budgets (as opposed to program budgets) in 2016 (based on budget analysis for 21 grantees for whom data was available). Overall, the program provides an estimated maximum of 25% of total spending on violence against women in SF. The program reaches ~20,000 people each year.

Needs of women and girls in San Francisco

• DOSW began working on violence against women in the 1980s because domestic violence was one of the leading causes of women’s deaths in SF at that time and VAW was the area of expertise for key champions of the C/DOSW.

• And C/DOSW realizes that there are a wide range of needs for women and girls in SF today**:

  – Today, we are in a care crisis, both for childcare and care for the elderly. Childcare costs for infants are estimated to be $21,000 per year in San Francisco, 30% higher than the state average. Eldercare, which is a critical issue as the population ages, is also limited both from the perspective of availability of affordable care facilities and high poverty levels of women aged 60+. Both these issues disproportionately affect women, and the over-60 population is majority women.

  – Certain segments of women and their families are in significant economic insecurity: African-American women, Latina women, single mothers, and older women are key segments facing acute economic insecurity in SF, in part linked to the care crisis***. For example, 26% of female-headed households lived below the federal poverty line in 2018, compared to 10% of the overall population.

*Does not include external grants which DOSW may manage with or for other entities

**Findings are based on a systematic analysis of levels and trends in 11 key needs across the lifecycle

***There is overlap between these segments
Executive Summary

- The impact of the care crisis as well as the disproportionate economic insecurity is likely to affect survivors of violence the most: VAW service providers consistently report housing and care services for survivors as a key unmet need, and there is an overrepresentation of African-American and Latina women among domestic violence survivors in SF, e.g. black women are 6% of SF’s female population but 30% of District Attorney Victim Services recipients.

- Other key needs, such as political representation, access to healthcare, and access to quality schooling are by and large more adequate in SF than in the rest of the nation, and key indicators have been improving over time. However, this is not to say more cannot be done.

Perceptions, Opportunities and Tensions for DOSW’s strategy:

Across 34 consultations (Commissioners, staff, external experts, community partners), there was:

- Agreement that C/DOSW has strong potential to improve the lives of women and girls in SF

- Appreciation by community partners of DOSW’s key strengths as a flexible, empathetic funder who has focused on building the VAW prevention and intervention sector in SF. External experts urged C/DOSW to clearly define its focus and differentiator, even while linking its efforts to the “bigger picture” of city government efforts to address key needs and the national conversation

- A desire for (i) a clear and strategic priority focus area(s), by target population and issue area, (ii) stronger impact measurement to ensure that C/DOSW activities are clearly aligned to the changing needs of women and girls in SF, (iii) deeper links to the rest of city government, to help C/DOSW influence city policies and honor its CEDAW mandate, (iv) streamlining of research and administrative activities to reduce time spent and increase impact (v) stronger, more cohesive, and transparent communication both within the Commission and between COSW and DOSW.
Emerging recommendations: Analysis thus far points to at least three “must-keep” factors for the next strategic plan...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VAW Grants Program</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>There is a real, ongoing need for this funding</strong>, evidenced by the hundreds of women who are turned away from service providers due to lack of bed space and staff capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Partners see DOSW as a critical and impactful funder</strong>, often one of their biggest funders, and key to the success of their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Reducing it significantly is politically not feasible</strong>, it will put DOSW’s current budget at risk and could lead to significant political backlash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities mapping to current mandates</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Mandates are required by law.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>DOSW is uniquely positioned to do this work</strong>, as it is both aligned with its legal mandates and a role unlikely to be played by any other actor in the ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing support to other city agencies</strong></td>
<td>• Continue supporting other agencies in taking a strong gender lens to their work via trainings, policy advocacy, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging recommendations: .. as well as five “must-change” factors, regardless of overall strategic direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamline how the DOSW conducts research</strong></td>
<td>• Reduce frequency, length and density of key reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure impact</strong></td>
<td>• Increase impact, by making insights more accessible and easy to digest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free up staff time, as currently, 20% of staff time is spent on research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthen internal and external communications</strong></td>
<td>• Increase impact, as current metrics measure output not outcomes, leading to limited ability to refine programs and services and allocate resources effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase impact and reduce perceived disempowerment, as interviews today show that internal communication is ineffective and external communication limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invest in data systems</strong></td>
<td>• Increase impact, by making insights more accessible and easy to digest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free up staff time, as currently, 20% of staff time is spent on research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a “Opportunity for Impact” fund</strong></td>
<td>• Ensure responsiveness/nimbleness without compromising primary focus, as many staff and Commissioners expressed a desire to respond to issues of the day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Streamline how the DOSW conducts research
  - Reduce frequency, length and density of key reports

- Measure impact
  - Invest in developing and collecting outcome metrics for all key Departmental functions

- Strengthen internal and external communications
  - Identify and mitigate internal communication pain points both between Commissioners and across C/DOSW

- Invest in data systems
  - Develop data collection and coding templates for analyses that are repeated for key reports, e.g., American Community Survey analysis

- Create a “Opportunity for Impact” fund
  - Earmark a small share of staff time (e.g., 5%) to respond to specific issues as they emerge, and a triaging system to prioritize based on strategic fit, e.g., “lead”, “support”, “decline”
Emerging recommendations: In addition, analysis showed four potential strategic directions for C/DOSW’s consideration:

1. Eliminating violence against women in San Francisco
   - **Sector Builder**
   - C/DOSW doubles down on its VAW work via the Grants Program and other avenues, actively working to build up an impactful, world-class support system to prevent and ultimately eradicate VAW in SF.

2. Ensuring a city govt that works for women
   - **Systems Shifter**
   - C/DOSW continues a core focus on VAW (as no other city agency meets this need), but combines it with multiple strategic partnerships to bring a strong gender lens to key city programs, e.g. around economic insecurity; minimizing work with the private sector.

3. Eliminating all forms of gender inequality
   - **Catalytic Leader**
   - C/DOSW is a convener and advocate for greater funding, programming and support to end gender inequity in all forms, in partnership with public/private actors. VAW focus remains but is only one of multiple pillars.

4. Building a better SF for a better America
   - **Bridge Builder**
   - C/DOSW chooses 3-4 areas where women are in most need in SF but also have most relevance nationally; partnering with peers in other cities to drive and demonstrate change; helping set the national agenda.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</th>
<th>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</th>
<th>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</th>
<th>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector Builder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Systems Shifter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catalytic Leader</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bridge Builder</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating violence against women in San Francisco</td>
<td>Ensuring a city govt that works for women</td>
<td>Eliminating all forms of gender inequality</td>
<td>Building a better SF for a better America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C/DOSW doubles down on its VAW work via the Grants Program and other avenues, actively working to build up an impactful, world-class support system to prevent and ultimately eradicate VAW in SF.</td>
<td>• C/DOSW continues a core focus on VAW (as no other city agency meets this need), but combines it with multiple strategic partnerships to bring a strong gender lens to key city programs, e.g. around economic insecurity; minimizing work with the private sector.</td>
<td>• C/DOSW is a convener and advocate for greater funding, programming and support to end gender inequity in all forms, in partnership with public/private actors. VAW focus remains but is only one of multiple pillars.</td>
<td>• C/DOSW chooses 3-4 areas where women are in most need in SF but also have most relevance nationally; partnering with peers in other cities to drive and demonstrate change; helping set the national agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOSW key role</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission of DOSW Under Strategic Option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector Builder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Systems Shifter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catalytic Leader</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bridge Builder</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging recommendations: Each of these strategic options map differently to a few key tradeoffs

Is C/DOSW fundamentally...

...Here to serve SF’s most marginalized women and girls...
...Here to ensure that the city government works for women...
...Here to serve the direct needs of those in SF...
...Here to primarily leverage and deploy city funds...
...Here to make a big difference on a single issue (e.g., violence against women)...
...Here to serve all women and girls in SF...
...Here to ensure that the entire city works for women...
...here to be a beacon for gender equality nationally
...here to raise resources via any avenue necessary
...here to address multiple needs of women and girls

Better SF
for Better America

Eliminating VAW
City Govt that works for women
Eliminating gender inequality

Dalberg

WORKING DRAFT: SUBJECT TO REVISION
**Next Steps:** Discuss emerging recommendations with C/DOSW leadership and build them out further

### For each “must-change” recommendation.
- Build out details on how this would be implemented
- Showcase analogs / examples of best practices

### For each strategic option
- Build out what this option looks like in practice and how it aligns with current portfolio and mandates
- Develop systematic criteria for evaluation, e.g., impact, political feasibility, administrative ease
- Assess each option against criteria and articulate tradeoffs
- For each option, look for analogs / examples of how this has been done in peer organizations or cities

---

This analysis will be used as the basis for the Nov 20 workshop
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Recall: The Commission and Department on the Status of Women was born out of the women’s movement in SF

1968-70: San Francisco Bay Area Women’s Coalition created out of a chapter of the National Organization of Women

1974: San Francisco members of this coalition launched a campaign for an Official City Commission on Women

1975: COSW created by an ordinance introduced by former Supervisor Dorothy von Beroldingen, the second woman to serve on the Board of Supervisors

1989: Community members and women organizers advocated for the creation of the Blue Ribbon Commission, to review the administrative structures and staffing capacity of the Commission

1994: Voters of San Francisco approved Proposition E which established a permanent Department of the Status of Women to carry out the Commission’s policies. It is from this vote action that the Department draws its authority and long-term sustainable presence in the city

Source: “Celebrating our past and embracing our future”, 25 Year Report of the Commission and Department on the Status of Women
Since inception, C/DOSW has had a number of key policy and programmatic achievements

- Women of San Francisco organize to adopt a local ordinance reflecting CEDAW, with COSW/DOSW oversight
- First CEDAW gender analysis of commission and board appointments
- Healthy Mothers Workplace Coalition is formed
- SF eliminates domestic violence-related homicides for unprecedented 44 months
- 2017 Paid Parental Leave Ordinance is passed, in part due to DOSW efforts
- 2018 Harassment Prevention Training Ordinance is passed, drafted by C/DOSW
- 2018 Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy adopted in SF


- COSW is created
- C/DOSW produces the Justice and Courage: A Blueprint for San Francisco's Response to Domestic Violence
- Gender Equality Principles initiative created
- Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking established
- Family Violence Council reconstituted
- 2017 Statewide CEDAW resolution passed, through C/DOSW advocacy
- State bills passed to bring SF Lactation Accommodation and Sex Worker Safety Policies to CA

Source: C/DOSW Website; Interviews with Staff
Today, C/DOSW is facing an imperative for change

• **The needs of women and girls in San Francisco are changing and evolving**, e.g., rent as a share of a single mother’s median income in 2016 rose from 50% in 2008 to 65% in 2016. At the same time, certain indicators of economic empowerment have improved, e.g., share of women in certain high paying professions (e.g., law) rose from 43% in 2006 to 51% in 2015.

• **City government is setting key new strategic priorities under Mayor London Breed’s leadership**, e.g., tackling homelessness; focus on racial equity; trauma-informed services etc.

• **The landscape of women’s issues and movements is changing**, e.g., violence against women becoming more prominent due to #MeToo and Times Up; momentum on federal and state level for Paid Family Leave/Childcare from 2020 Presidential election candidates from both parties

• **Commissioners bring differing types of expertise and strategic aspirations for the Department**, seeking to fully understand what the Department does today and what it could do more of in the future.

• **Department staff have all expressed that there are not enough staff resources to meet all of the current and shifting priorities**

  • Systematic analysis on the changing external context is provided later in this document

Source: Status of Women and Girls, 2016; DOSW Website; Interviews with Commissioners and DOSW staff
C/DOSW is conducting strategic planning to respond to this imperative; and this document is the first step in the process.

This document

**INTERNAL SCAN:**
Understand what the Department does today, key achievements, underlying principles guiding the work, and aspirations for vision forward

**EXTERNAL SCAN:**
Rapid scan (5 subject matter experts) of external landscape and status of women and girls in SF today, highlighting needs today and trends forward

**STRATEGIC OPTIONS:**
Develop and shortlist portfolio options

**FINAL PLAN:**
Prepare final deliverable reflecting workshop outcome, plan next steps

Source: Dalberg Scope of Work, updated following conversations with DOSW Leadership
Any strategy proposed must align with C/DOSW’s mandates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandate</th>
<th>Source of mandate</th>
<th>Example of mandated activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the principles of the Convention on the Elimination of all</td>
<td>San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 12K</td>
<td>• Conduct trainings for other city departments on human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>with a gender perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the status of women and girls both within the City and County</td>
<td>San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 33</td>
<td>• Conduct and publish gender analysis of Commissions and Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government and within the private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff the Family Violence Council</td>
<td>Family Violence Council Ordinance</td>
<td>• Sexual harassment reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor women’s depiction and representation on city property</td>
<td>San Francisco Administrative Code, 0243-18</td>
<td>• Coordinate services and improve communication across department; analyze trends and data related to family violence in SF, statewide, and nationally; and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Courts about these trends and recommend strategies to reduce incidence of family violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from these higher level mandates, there are a number of other specific, mandated requirements regarding DOSW’s role on councils, operations and reporting standards e.g., service on the JUSTIS Governance Council, collect and report on performance metrics, compliance with Sunshine laws etc.

Source: DOSW Website; City Ordinances; Interviews with DOSW staff
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C/DOSW includes seven Commissioners, and seven full time staff

**Commission on Status of Women**
- **President**: Breanna Zwart
- **Vice President**: Dr. Shokoooh Miry

**Commissioner**: Andrea Shorter
**Commissioner**: Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz
**Commissioner**: Debbie Mesloh
**Commissioner**: Julie Soo
**Commissioner**: Sophia Andary

**Mayor’s Office**
- **Mayor**: London Breed

**Department on Status of Women**
- **Director**: Emily Murase, PhD

**Executive Management Assistant**: Herschell Larrick

**Fiscal and Policy Manager**: Natalie Alvarez
**Policy and Grants Manager**: Elise Hansell

**Policy and Projects Director**: Elizabeth Newman, MPP

**Policy and Grants Associate**: Kyoko Peterson**
**Associate Director**: Carol Sacco

Staff time is a critical parameter to consider for the strategic planning process

Source: DOSW Website
DOSW’s annual budget is $9.4M, <0.1% of city budget but comparable to many private funders of gender equality.

**2018-9 Annual Funding Estimates**

US$ Million

- **DOSW**: 9.4
- **SF City**: 11,000

**NOTES ON PRIVATE SPENDING**

- Key private foundations focused on gender equality (e.g., Women’s Foundation of California and BlueShield Foundation) spend an estimated ~$3.5-25 million per year across California.

- The California Gender Justice Funders Network, a collective of 5 foundations working on gender equality across California, has a budget of $10M.

- Systematic data on private foundation spending in San Francisco is not available.

Budget over time has been historically been driven by city funds, and DOSW has recently received 2 major grants

**DOSW’s budget**

‘000 US$

- **CDSS (State grant)**
- **DOJ Grant**
- **BlueShield Foundation**
- **Friends of COSW Grants**
- **DOSW General Support Funds & Other Revenues**

2011-2017 Budget growth came from increased General Support Funds & Marriage License revenues (~100%)

2017-2019 Budget growth came from 2 major external grant sources – CDSS and BlueShield. Combined with continued support from DOJ, they account for a ~140% increase. The CDSS grant is scheduled over 3 years and allocated as single block grant

Source: City & County of SF Budget Book 2011-2019; DOSW Internal Documents; DOSW Staff Interviews

*California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Grant is considered a one-time block grant in latest budget book

**DOJ Historical Grants: US$750,000 for 2018-2021, US$ 750,000 for 2015-2018 & US$ 1.35M for 09/2009-03/2014, all annualized for this analysis; BlueShield Foundation is assumed to be linearly distributed 2019-2020

***Other External Grants include a, 2014-2019 Other External grants are funds for the Department Fellowship Program
Over 80% of DOSW’s budget is disbursed as grants, with the remaining allocated primarily to staff time.

Breakdown of DOSW’s ongoing budget*

Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Staff Compensation</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ongoing Budget does not include outside grant data as in the previous slide. Total for each year above is based on respective SF budget book line items: DOSW Budget US$ 6.9M (2015-2016), 7M (2016-2017) and 8M (2017-2018)

**Other includes expenses in materials and supplies, services of other departments, professional services etc.
DOSW currently operates across nine key activities, in five key functional areas

- **Direct grantmaking** via the Violence Against Women Prevention and Intervention program
- **Coordination/Implementation of Private, Federal, and State Grants**, e.g., the CDSS, BlueShield, and DOJ grants
- **Policy advocacy**, including drafting legislation, advocating for legislation, and supporting implementation of newly passed laws
- **Gender integration within the city government**, e.g., gender inclusion training
- **Leading and staffing multi-stakeholder initiatives**, e.g., Mayor’s Task Force on Human Trafficking

- **Research**, including mandated reports (e.g., Family Violence in SF Reports) and optional reports (e.g., Status of Women 2018)

- **Field building**, e.g., supporting the California Association of CSWs
- **Community engagement**, e.g., DV awareness month

- **Administration, accounting, and financial oversight functions**, e.g., mandatory reporting to the city on language accessibility, performance and budget reporting

Source: DOSW Documents, Interviews with Staff
Today, DOSW’s time is split equally among categories, with exception of field building/community engagement

**Estimated breakdown of staff time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of total staff time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The analysis includes 7 full time staff and three Fellows who work at 32 hrs per week (0.8 of a full time employee). Executive Director’s time is assumed to be split equally among all key activities.

**Increasing access to services for women and girls (21%)**
- Direct grantmaking: 6.5%
- Coordination/Implementation of Private, Federal, and State Grants: 14%

**Strengthening the gender lens of government (26%)**
- Policy advocacy: 6.3%
- Gender integration within the city government: 5.4%
- Leading /Staffing multi-stakeholder initiatives: 14.4%

**Creating and disseminating data-driven insights (19%)**
- Research: 19.4%

**Field building and community engagement (9%)**
- Field Building: 1.7%
- Community Engagement: 7%

**Administration, accounting, and financial oversight (25%)**
- Administration, Accounting & Financial Oversight: 25.3%

Source: Dalberg analysis; based on interviews with each staff member.
In terms of issue area, C/DOSW primarily focuses on violence against women and workplace equity.

Needs of women and girls across the lifecycle:

- Free from the threat of violence and bullying on the streets, at work, in the home, and online
- Able to access quality schooling
- Equitably included and rewarded in the workplace and as entrepreneurs
- Financially secure for retirement
- Economically secure and able to afford basic necessities such as housing and food
- Politically engaged and represented
- Able to access quality affordable physical, reproductive, and mental health care
- Treated with dignity and respect by media and other institutions
- Equitably responsible for housework and other unpaid work within the home
- Access to quality affordable childcare
- Access to quality affordable eldercare

Source: Dalberg analysis; conversations with DOSW staff; review of Annual and Director’s reports
**VAW:** The violence against women (VAW) work cuts across all functions; particularly direct access to services

- **Direct grantmaking** via the Violence Against Women Prevention and Intervention Grants Program
- **Coordination/Implementation of Private, Federal, and State Grants**, e.g., the Bayview grant that seeks to better identify and provide services to domestic violence victims at high risk of death or serious injury

**Increasing access to services for women and girls**

- **Policy advocacy**, such as for AB 2243, protections for sex workers who report witnessing or experiencing violence
- **Gender integration within the city government**, e.g., the Domestic Violence Liaison program, signage in airports to reduce human trafficking
- **Leading and staffing multi-stakeholder initiatives**, e.g., Mayor’s Task Force on Human Trafficking

**Strengthening the gender lens of government**

- **Research**, e.g., Family Violence Council Report, Human Trafficking Report

**Generating and disseminating data-driven insights**

- **Field building**, e.g., awards for silence breakers
- **Community engagement**, e.g., Domestic Violence awareness month

**Field building and community engagement**

- **Administration, accounting, and financial oversight functions**, e.g., mandatory reporting to the city on VAW performance metrics

**Administration, accounting, and financial oversight**

Source: DOSW Annual Reports, Interviews with Staff
VAW: Today, DOSW provides an estimated max 25% of total VAW funding in SF through the VAW Grants Program

Sources of funding to reduce violence against women and girls in SF
Estimated %, Latest year available (2011 for foundations, 2017-2018 for other sources)

- **Corporations**: 2%  
- **Pvt. Foundations**: 40%  
- **DOJ**: Not available**  
- **State funding (CalOES & CalVCB)**: 32%  
- **DOSW**: 25%

**KEY NOTES**

- **Total estimated spending on domestic violence reduction efforts is $27.6 M (excluding DOJ spending).** By comparison, San Francisco’s city government public protection budget was $1.7 billion in 2019.

- **The Commission began funding domestic violence programs in 1980.** La Casa de las Madres was the first program to ever receive DOSW support via a $75,000 grant. The program has historically been a key area of focus for DOSW, featured in every strategic plan since at least 2004.

- **The program had a $6.8 million annual spend in 2017-8.** Anti-domestic violence organizations have played a key role in growing the DOSW’s budget over time, as well as steering its strategic direction.

**Notes:**

- The DOJ Office of Violence Against Women provides some funding for domestic violence in San Francisco but does not readily break down estimates by city. In addition, some federal funding is channelled through state and local sources, so it is excluded to avoid double counting.

Source: Dalberg analysis. DOSW data taken from annual budget. CalVCB is the California Victims Compensation Board which distributes funds a portion of its annual funds to Domestic Violence survivors. California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) data include the Domestic Violence Assistance Program, Domestic Violence Housing First program, Family Violence Prevention Program, Domestic Violence Response Team Program, Native American Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (DS) Program, and Statewide Domestic Violence Prevention Resource Center (PV) Program. Corporation data is estimated based on a review of top 5 corporations that provide domestic violence funding nationally; private foundation estimate (latest available) is from a BlueShield Foundation report in 2011.
VAW: VAW program funding is provided to 28 grantees, and comprises between 0.2% - 43% of their total budgets.

Grantee budget by funding source
US$ Million, 2016 (latest year available), for 21 of 28 grantees for whom total budget data was available.

Grant sizes range from $50,000-$600,000, with most grants around $200,000.

Funding is usually provided as 3-year grants, based on an open and competitive bidding process. Ongoing funding is allocated annually, assuming grant objectives and goals are met.

How can DOSW be most strategic and additive in its VAW investments, reflecting its role in the landscape and relative to other funders?

Note: The total budget is all dollars going into the entire partner agency from all sources across programs. Specific DOSW-funded program budgets within broader partner agency ‘umbrella’ may have a different budget breakdown.

Source: Dalberg Analysis; based on DOSW data & grantee Form 990s data from 2016. Dalberg used 2017-2018 DOSW VAW Grant allocations and deducted the annual Cost of Doing Business Increase (COBD) to find 2016-2017 data. Form 990 2016 data for grantees can be calendar or fiscal year (IRS regulations).
VAW: Program partners provide a key suite of needed services; and reach ~20,000 survivors

Range of services provided
Estimated $ Million, 2017-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Estimated $ Million, 2017-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention and Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women and girl survivors reached by DOSW programming
Estimated ‘000s, 2018

20,698

This is likely to be a high share of survivors seeking services, given that ~100,000 (1 in 4) women and girls in SF are likely to experience gender based violence in their life and DOSW partners serve 20,000 women annually.

Source: VAW Performance Report, 2017-18. Note, budget as reported in Performance Report is $6.6M, but is reported here as $6.8M as per DOSW Budget Book for consistency.
VAW: Each of these six types of services address the needs of survivors differently

- **Prevention and education**: Workshops for survivors, youth, and those at risk, covering topics like self-esteem, self-defense, and healthy relationships.

- **Crisis Lines**: Two crisis lines that operate 24x7 to support survivors.

- **Shelters**: Access to beds and counselling / case management / referrals.

- **Transitional Housing**: Access to short or long term housing and counselling / case management / referrals.

- **Legal Services**: Assistance with restraining order applications, criminal victim impact statements, marriage dissolution, advocacy and court accompaniment during child custody cases, etc.

- **Intervention and advocacy**: Case management, safety planning, counseling, information, referrals, and support to heal.

Workplace Equity: The workplace equity portfolio is newer to DOSW, but comprises a mix of public and private sector work

- **DV Liaison program**, which has trained over 60 liaisons to provide support and increased connection to services for city employees experiencing domestic violence
- **Policy advocacy**, such as for local adoption and implementation of lactation in the workplace and Paid Parental Leave (2016)
- **Gender integration within the city government**, e.g., Gender Inclusion Trainings at Rec and Park
- **Leading and staffing multi-stakeholder initiatives**, e.g., Gender Equality Principles and Challenge Initiative, Healthy Families Workplace Coalition
- **Research**, e.g., Status of Women and Girls report (2016) which includes pay gap analysis, gender analysis
- **Field building**, e.g., awards for Healthy Families Workplace Coalition, GEP Initiative website, social media, email list
- **Community engagement**, e.g., Domestic Violence awareness month, Gender Equity Principles outreach and events (e.g., paid leave playbook, roundtable on pay equity and guide to equal pay)
- **Administration, accounting, and financial oversight functions**, e.g., mandatory reporting to the city on sexual harassment complaints in the city's workplace

Source: DOSW Annual Reports, Interviews with Staff
Performance metrics for the DOSW’s work cut across functions and issue areas, but are currently output focused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2017-18 Actual</th>
<th>Performance against target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly increasing access to services for women and girls</td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Hours of supportive service provided</td>
<td>39,825</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Number of calls to crisis lines</td>
<td>11,097</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Number of individuals served</td>
<td>20,698</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Number of individuals turned away</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Number of shelter bed nights</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>+98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Number of transitional housing bed nights</td>
<td>18,029</td>
<td>+58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Grantmaking:</strong> Percent of people accessing services for whom English is not a primary language</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-13 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect grant coordination and implementation: <em>Grant-specific metrics</em></td>
<td><strong>Gender integration into city government:</strong> Number of City programs and agencies reviewed under the Women’s Human Rights Ordinance (CEDAW)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Met target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender integration into city government:</strong> Percent of staff completing “Preventing Workplace Harassment Training”</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Met target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy advocacy:</strong> Number of resolutions passed by the Commission on the Status of Women recognizing important women and girls’ achievements and promoting gender equality and human rights:</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating and disseminating data driven insights</td>
<td>No metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field building and community engagement</td>
<td><strong>Community Engagement:</strong> Number of educational forums conducted on gender equality in the workplace.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration,</td>
<td>No metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Francisco Performance Results for Fiscal Year 2017-18. Note, the policy advocacy measure has been since revised by DOSW staff.
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Recall: Women and girls face a spectrum of needs across the lifecycle

- Free from the threat of violence and bullying on the streets, at work, in the home, and online
- Able to access quality schooling
- Equitably included and rewarded in the workplace and as entrepreneurs
- Financially secure for retirement
- Economically secure and able to afford basic necessities such as housing and food
- Politically engaged and represented
- Able to access quality affordable physical, reproductive, and mental health care
- Treated with dignity and respect by the media and other institutions
- Equitably responsible for housework and other unpaid work within the home
- Access to quality affordable childcare
- Access to quality affordable eldercare

Source: Dalberg analysis
To identify which of these needs are particularly pressing in SF, we looked at levels and trends of key indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Indicators used (non-exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free from the threat of violence and bullying on the streets, at work, in the home, and online</td>
<td>• Incidence of online bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homicides rates related to domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to access quality schooling</td>
<td>• School enrollment and dropout rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitably included and rewarded in the work place and as entrepreneurs</td>
<td>• Gender pay gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number and proportion of women-owned businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially secure for retirement</td>
<td>• Poverty levels for those aged 60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically secure and able to afford basic necessities such as housing and food</td>
<td>• Incidence of poverty, homelessness, and food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically engaged and represented</td>
<td>• Share of women in leadership positions in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to access quality affordable physical, reproductive, and mental health care</td>
<td>• Incidence of maternal mortality and depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to abortion services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SF-specific data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with dignity and respect by the media and other institutions</td>
<td>• SF-specific data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitably responsible for housework and other unpaid work within the home</td>
<td>• Childcare availability and costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality affordable childcare</td>
<td>• Eldercare availability and costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality affordable eldercare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dalberg analysis, using data from DOSW, DYCF, US Census Bureau, UN Women Reports and a range of issue-specific literature and reports
Today, women and girls in SF are in a care crisis; and, certain segments are facing acute economic insecurity.

**Comparative Analysis of Trends in Categorized Needs of Women and Girls**

**Better than CA / national average**
- Women and girls in SF are in a care crisis – childcare costs are $21,000 per year, 30% more than California average, and the population is aging and financially insecure even as availability of affordable eldercare options are declining, e.g., beds at small residential facilities (0-15 beds) fell 40% between 2012-18
- Financially secure for retirement
- Access to quality affordable childcare
- Access to quality affordable eldercare
- While more can undoubtedly be done, workplace equity, schooling, political representation, and access to healthcare indicators are overall strong relative to CA/national averages, and improving over time for women in SF

**Worse than CA / national average**
- Economically secure and able to afford basic necessities such as housing and food
- Free from the threat of violence and bullying on the streets, at work, in the home, and online
- African-American women, single mothers, older women, and survivors of violence are facing acute economic insecurity, even though overall averages for women’s economic security are better in SF than California or the US. For example, 26% single mother households were below the federal poverty line, in SF Metropolitan Area* compared to 10% of the overall SF population

**Improving over the last decade**
- Equitably included in the work place and as entrepreneurs
- Able to access quality schooling
- Politically engaged and represented
- Able to access quality affordable physical, reproductive, and mental health care

**Worsening over the last decade**
- Access to quality affordable eldercare

Source: Dalberg analysis; US Census Bureau data; San Francisco Long Term Care Coordinating Council Assisted Working Group Report 2018; KidsData.org - A Program of the Lucile Packard Foundation for Children’s Health

Data on equitably responsible for housework and other unpaid work within the home; or women being treated with dignity and respect by the media and other institutions, is not available

*SF Metropolitan Area is defined as SF-Oakland-Hayward regions
Eldercare and childcare are key issues for women; childcare costs are $21,000 per year, 30% higher than state averages

**FINANCIAL SECURITY FOR RETIREMENT**
- 18% of women aged 60+ in SF live below the Federal Poverty Line, compared to 11% nationally.
- Women aged 60+ are 2x more likely than men to live below FPL
- While SF specific data is not available, national research from the Schwab Foundation shows this gender gap starts as early as ages 16-25.

**ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILDCARE**
- Childcare in San Francisco costs US 21,000 annually (infant) which is 30% higher than state average
- CalWORKS caseload, a federal and state funded program which helps cover childcare costs, decreased 26% 2013-2018 in SF.

**ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE ELDERCARE**
- Small & affordable Adult Residential Facilities (0-15 beds) declined by 40% 2012-2018
- Total beds increased by 3% in the same time period driven by larger capacity & more expensive institutions
- By 2030, seniors will account for 26% of SF’s population, an increase of 100,000 individuals, majority women

African-American and Latina women, single mothers, and older women are most economically insecure

**Comparative Income Inequality Ratios**
Ratio of income of households in 95<sup>th</sup> percentile to 20<sup>th</sup> percentile, 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>NYC</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS INEQUALITY MANIFESTS AS ECONOMIC INSECURITY FOR THREE KEY SEGMENTS OF WOMEN**

- **African-American & Latina women**: These segments make around 45% of white men’s income, lowest among all races (white women made 76%) and black families had a poverty rate of 23% compared to 8% for all families in SF

- **Single Mothers**: 26% of such households in SF Metropolitan Area** were at or below the Federal Poverty Line compared to an estimated 10% for the general SF population

- **Older women (60+)**: 61% of elder women living alone are below the California Elder Economic Security Standard Index.* Men see similar rates, however, women are majority of the 60+ population

- There is overlap between these segment categories, but data available is insufficient to quantify overlap


*For example, a ratio of 15.0 means that households in the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile have incomes 15 times a household in the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile

**For an elderly renter living alone in San Francisco, the Elder Index is approximately $29,000/year
Prevalence of violence against women is likely declining but VAW survivors face service & economic challenges

Available data suggests a nexus between housing, care, and intervention services for survivors

- Women of color are over-represented among both economically insecure populations (see prior slide) and domestic violence survivors in SF.
  - For example, >60% of domestic violence survivors are women of color, compared to 54% share of the overall population.

- In particular, housing services remains cited as a key need for survivors across all races.
  - A 2018 survey of service providers showed over 70% cite housing as a key need for their clients.
  - Focus groups with DOSW partners confirmed this, citing lack of income, housing and childcare as two significant barriers to overcoming violence.

“We are unable to serve or track some of our [domestic violence survivor] clients because they move out of the city – they can’t afford to live here. They can’t afford childcare. Not only do we lose them, but more importantly, they lose access to critical services that only exist here because of DOSW funding”

Political representation, health care access, schooling and workplace & entrepreneurial equity exhibit positive trends

**POLITICALLY ENGAGED AND REPRESENTED**

- Women’s representation on policy bodies is 51% and 36% of current SF Board of Supervisors, while there are 31% women in California’s state legislature.

**ABLE TO ACCESS QUALITY AFFORDABLE PHYSICAL, REPRODUCTIVE, AND, MENTAL HEALTH CARE**

- 10 maternal deaths recorded in San Francisco 2012-2018 while national maternal mortality is 17 deaths per 100,000 births and increasing
- Major racial disparities persist; black women comprised half of all maternal deaths in SF and 42.8 deaths/100,000 births nationally
- In 2017, approximately 32% of high school girls in SF reported depressive signs, though statistically lower than 40% national average.

**ABLE TO ACCESS QUALITY SCHOOLING**

- Girls have a 1.5% drop out rate in the SF Unified School District in 2018, compared to national average of 5% for girls.

**EQUITABLY INCLUDED IN WORK PLACE AND AS ENTERPRENEURS**

- Total number of women-owned businesses in SF increased by 41% 2002-2012 and were 36% of total.
- Gender pay gap, though still significant, has reduced by 5% 2006-2013 to 82%.
  Major disparities by education level and race persist.


Note: Data and statistics are subject to revision.
The city government currently spends >$1.3B to address key pressing needs such as care and economic insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of need</th>
<th>City Agency</th>
<th>Budget (2018-19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to access quality affordable childcare</td>
<td>Children and Families Commission (First5)</td>
<td>$29 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Children, Youth and their Families</td>
<td>$239 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Early Care and Education (Human Services Agency)</td>
<td>$104 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to access quality affordable eldercare</td>
<td>Department of Aging and Adult Services</td>
<td>$332 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially secure for retirement</td>
<td>Office for Financial Empowerment (under Office of Treasurer / Tax Collector)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically secure and able to afford basic necessities such as housing and food</td>
<td>Human Services (Human Services Agency)</td>
<td>$409 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Homelessness and Supportive Housing</td>
<td>$271 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Agency list is not exhaustive. Budgets represented include both programmatic and administrative spending.

Source: City & County of SF Budget Book 2018-19
Adding a strong gender lens to city initiatives can significantly improve reach and impact on women

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

• Between 2002-2014, following a high profile domestic violence homicide, the C/DOSW brought together members from a range of city agencies – the Adult Probation Dept., the Office of the DA, Police Dept, Sheriff’s Dept, Dept. of Emergency Management, etc. to provide a stronger and more gender-transformative approach to addressing violence response in SF.

• C/DOSW led the development of an Oversight Panel, a Strategic Plan, and an Audit Committee to identify gaps and monitor progress.

• Over 170 recommendations to strengthen the system were made, of which 121 were implemented in this time period. These included, for example
  • Creating 911 codes specific to domestic violence,
  • Notifying victims when offenders are released or transferred
  • Increasing interdepartmental communication and coordination via training 911 responders, probationary officers, police officers, etc., all together via a victim-centered approach

• In part due to these efforts, domestic violence related homicides reduced dramatically over time, and services available to survivors increased.

Source: DOSW Justice and Courage process.
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What are the key needs of women and girls in San Francisco today, and how are they changing?
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What do stakeholders see as key issues, opportunities, and tensions for the C/DOSW’s strategy?
We gathered perspectives from all of COSW/DOSW’s core constituents to inform the strategy process.

Interviewees were asked three broad categories of questions:

*Where do you see the Department today from an overall strategy perspective?*

*What do you want to see more of? Where do you see the Department being particularly additive to other actors?*

*What do you want to see less of? What are the pain points?*
Commissioners and staff agree DOSW has strong potential but can benefit from focus, metrics, deeper links to city govt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th># of Commissioner and staff interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| COSW / DOSW has strong potential      | • “We are one of the only funded Commissions”  
• “We are one of the few feminist funders”  
• “We have a committed team”  
• “We are the strongest CSW in the state, perhaps the country”                                                                                                                       | <2                                      |
| Currently, DOSW is taking on too many different areas | • “What do you mean by what more we can do? We already do so much”  
• “We need to really choose 1-2 areas and go deep”  
• “We are just spread too thin, to be honest”                                                                                                                                   | 2-5                                     |
| Currently, impact metrics are not adequate | • “Most of our metrics currently only count outputs, not measure impact”  
• “The Mayor wants to increase government accountability. I think we need new metrics”                                                                                             | 5-10                                    |
| Currently, DOSW is not deeply connected to rest of the city govt | • “We are so small, it is hard for the city government to sometimes remember us”  
• “We aren’t really consulted as much as we would like to be, even on initiatives that really affect women”  
• “To be effective and honor our CEDAW mandate, we need to be more tightly linked to the rest of city govt”                                                                          | >10                                     |

Source: Interviews with Staff and Commissioners
Research and administrative responsibilities emerged as key areas that staff and Commissioners wanted streamlined.

### Themes

#### Research

- “We regularly produce academic-quality reports that are 100+ pages long with beautiful images – but are they used?”

- “By the time we finish writing one report, it’s time for the next – this leaves us no time to implement recommendations. Surely we can reduce the frequency or streamline the process”

#### Administration, accounting, and financial oversight

- “We do an incredible amount of administrative work – which I believe is largely invisible”

- “Surely there must be ways in which we can streamline our reporting, via investing in systems”

### Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th># of Commissioner and staff interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>&lt;2&lt;br&gt;2-5&lt;br&gt;5-10&lt;br&gt;&gt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, accounting, and financial oversight</td>
<td>&lt;2&lt;br&gt;2-5&lt;br&gt;5-10&lt;br&gt;&gt;10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews with Staff and Commissioners
Commissioners and staff diverged on DOSW’s issue and population focus, as well as whether and how to be nimble

Issue area focus

- “The VAW program defines us and provides critical lifesaving services; it will remain part of the strategy of course”
- “Violence against women is a key area of need – but have we considered adding others like housing affordability – also a need?”
- “It seems radical to even ask the question – should we have such a strong focus on violence against women?”

Population focus

- “We are most additive when we support other city departments – that is what CEDAW is fundamentally about”
- “Our reports have found that 3 in 4 women work in the private sector – supporting the city is important but not enough”
- “I’d like to see more of a focus on marginalized women – older women, immigrants of color”

Responsiveness to urgent or timely issues

- “When we find ourselves as a team in these pivotal tentpole moments for the women’s movement across the country, what is our view of how and when we step up? Do we have a framework or criteria? Do we want to act and if so how? ”

Source: Interviews with Staff and Commissioners
Multiple interviewees (but not all) called out pain points of lack of communication and perceived disempowerment

**Themes**

**Quotes**

**Within the Commission**

- “The rigidity of the Sunshine Laws make it hard to have a real conversation – doesn’t feel like a deliberative body. I know some of the other commissions aren’t so strict in this regard”
- “Communication today just doesn’t work – we don’t have space to actually discuss anything.”
- “I feel disempowered – like my voice isn’t heard”
- “We need more transparent and open communication or else it’s hard to make decisions”

**Between Commission and staff**

- “I don’t think I fully know what the staff does, making it hard to support them”
- “Commissioners don’t see a lot of the invisible work that goes on in the Department”
- “There is a question of what exactly is your role as a commissioner? It’s a sense that your voice isn’t welcome, you don’t know what to do”

Source: Interviews with Staff and Commissioners
Community partners commended DOSW’s flexibility, empathy, and support to build a strong network of services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th># of interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Flexibility**                       | • “The flexibility of DOSW funding allows me to tailor my programs to my community's changing needs”  
• “Flexibility of DOSW’s funding is so critical to being there for our community. Unlike other funders, they don’t prescribe every activity. It helps me mobilize my efforts to address a crisis. It literally saves lives”  
• “DOSW’s flexibility helps us do our jobs better”                                                                                       | <2, 2-5, 5-10, >10 |
| **Empathy**                           | • “DOSW gets it. They prioritize women’s needs and community needs over checking the box on every paperwork deadline – not like other funders”  
• “DOSW are in the trenches with us. They have been doing this for so long. I worry they are stretched thin, but I never worry that they won’t be there for us when we need them” | <2, 2-5, 5-10, >10 |
| **Support to build seamless network of services** | • “Thanks to DOSW, there is a strong DV network. This is very important. Survivors don’t get that many chances to seek support”  
• “Every door is the right door. That’s the beauty of the current DV service network in SF. It’s not like this in other counties”  
• “DOSW does a lot to convene us, to build a community. I wish they did more, like trainings and helping us with skills. But they do a lot already to build the network” | <2, 2-5, 5-10, >10 |

Source: Focus groups and interviews with 13 VAW program partners
External experts urged DOSW to take a focused and catalytic approach, but link to the broader suite of women’s needs

**Focus**
- “Honestly – I’m not too sure what the DOSW does right now – what is their focus exactly?
- “You can’t take everything on – but you can choose 1-2 things to do yourself and partner with others for the rest”
- “Pick a north star. Are you trying to make SF better for women? All women? Are you trying to make the city govt better? You can’t do it all”

**Catalytic approach**
- “You’re in this incredibly unique place – of being the city agency tasked with this. Shift the system!”
- “I’d love to see the C/DOSW do more work to take a gender lens to the city govt – as long as that doesn’t translate into more bureaucracy”
- “You’re in SF – the birthplace of so many progressive movements. Let’s show the country what good looks like for women”
- “DOSW knows they can’t do this alone. Strategic partnerships are the key”

**Bring a strong gender lens to issues like economic insecurity**
- “Women in SF are in crisis – and it is somewhat invisible. No one talks about the gender lens on economic insecurity but it is there. DOSW can help amplify this”

Source: Interviews with Staff and Commissioners
In sum, DOSW’s strengths are a unique mandate and the VAW portfolio, but it needs focus, communication & impact metrics.

Key assets
- Unique mandate of being a city agency focused on gender, opportunity to shift broader city systems
- Flexible, empathetic, “sector-building” approach to VAW work and high levels of trust with existing grantees

Key limitations
- Perceived lack of focus and strategy, with time spent on low value tasks
- Ineffective internal communication, limiting impact and leading to feelings of disempowerment
- Lack of clear impact metrics

Source: Interviews with Staff, Commissioners, Experts, Community Partners