MEMORANDUM

TO: Hon. Mayor London N. Breed
    Hon. Members, Board of Supervisors

CC: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Office of Racial Equity, Human Rights Commission

DATE: December 31, 2021

RE: Racial Equity Report Card (“Index”) for San Francisco

Summary

Ordinance No 188-19 directs the Office of Racial Equity to create a Racial Equity Report Card about the “status of Racial Equity and the indicators of success by Race” in San Francisco. Community organizations have noted issues with the accuracy and reliability of initial American Community Survey and other data compiled by ORE and City departments. In 2022, ORE will host community workshops to surface additional data - both quantitative and qualitative - before releasing the Index as a public website.

Introduction

Over the last year, the Office of Racial Equity (ORE) has been developing a Racial Equity Report Card that reflects the “status of Racial Equity and the indicators of success by Race” in San Francisco, as directed by Ordinance No 188-19. ORE now refers to the Racial Equity Report Card as the San Francisco Racial Equity Index (“Index”). The name “Index” reflects that transformational work towards racial justice is ongoing and along a continuum of change, i.e., there is no “A+” rating.

In addition to the December 31, 2021 deadline specified in the Ordinance No 188-19, ORE’s mandate and the urgency of now has fueled the drive to release an initial Index to daylight racial disparities and hold San Francisco institutions accountable for dismantling racism. In collaboration with Racial Equity Leaders and other staff across City departments, ORE has identified initial indicators and data for the Index. Early discussions with community stakeholders about the data have surfaced concerns, such as:

- Data assumptions and methodologies that misrepresent outcomes for specific racial/ethnic groups
- Limited indicators not reflecting the full reality of people’s lives
- Potential for the Index to become a performative “check the box” exercise, rather than a means to create accountability and transparency.
Through 2022, ORE will host workshops with a broader set of community organizations to refine the initial indicators, discuss and revise methodologies, and surface additional data - both quantitative and qualitative - before releasing the Index as a public website.

**Issue Areas and Indicator Criteria**

From December 2020 to March 2021, ORE worked with pro bono consultants through the Office of Civic Innovation’s Civic Bridge program to refine issues areas and narrow the universe of indicators. This included research into other racial equity indices and best practices, a review of the landscape of existing San Francisco measures and reports, and interviews with City subject matter experts. Beyond the issue areas mandated in legislation, ORE identified additional issue areas that are important to the collective liberation of San Francisco’s communities of color. The initial areas and indicators considered are summarized in the Appendix.

**Issue areas mandated in legislation**

- Climate, environment, and transportation justice
- Community health and wellness
- Education, knowledge, and community wisdom
- Housing, homelessness, and land use
- Policing and criminal justice
- Wealth-building, economic justice, and fair employment

**Additional issue areas identified by ORE**

- Arts and culture
- Information technology and digital equity
- Food justice and sovereignty
- Gender justice
- Youth and older adults

ORE used the criteria below to prioritize a limited set of indicators for initial data work with the Controller’s City Performance Group (CPG). From October to December 2021, CPG allocated a set number of hours to source and prepare data for the prioritized indicators, drawing largely on American Community Survey, State, and City datasets and pre-existing analysis categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Level Criteria</th>
<th>Useful to community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify injustice that community is discussing, advocating, and organizing around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captures historical injustice in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible/tangible in people's daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in indicator is a movement towards liberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Useful to City staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful for further analysis or decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be used to replace an existing proxy indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important for City accountability and needs to be developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be used to calculate change over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated regularly, especially annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORE also partnered with Civic Bridge again to secure pro bono designers and web developers for the Index. The design and web development team assessed user needs, developed design themes and data visualizations, and prepared an online platform on which the final Index can be released to the public.

**Data Concerns and Challenges**

Throughout the data sourcing process, ORE presented updates to the Human Rights Commission Community Roundtable. In those conversations, as well as in follow-up discussions with a small number of community organizations, especially the American Indian Cultural District, California Consortium for Urban Indian Health, Friendship House, and Native American Health Center, we have heard several clear concerns about:

- Data assumptions and methodologies that misrepresent outcomes for specific racial/ethnic groups
- Limited indicators not reflecting the full reality of people’s lives
- Potential for the Index to become a performative “check the box” exercise, rather than a means to create accountability and transparency.

These concerns reflect longstanding issues with data collection and analysis practices across all levels of government. ORE’s own review raises the same concerns about the potential for inaccurate and unreliable data narratives to cause further harm. Requests for next steps before ORE releases the Index included:

- **Validate data methodology and narratives with community, and establish consistency across City departments.** Community-based researchers have deep expertise on the limitations of existing federal, state, and local government datasets, and how to accurately analyze data given those limitations. The methodology used for every indicator should be carefully reviewed and validated with them before the Index is released.

- **Report on data for communities of color in San Francisco in ways that match their specific histories and experiences, instead of only using high-level Census categories.** Data for each community needs to be transformed and disaggregated in a different way, given known disparities between and within racial/ethnic groups. Examples included capturing differences in outcomes for: American Indians who are and are not multiracial; specific Asian ethnicities; African immigrants, Afro Latinos, and African Americans; Arabs (who are primarily categorized by the U.S. Census Bureau as white).

- **Include additional indicators and data sources to increase relevancy.** There were many specific suggestions for readily available indicators that:
  - Felt more relevant to daily life experiences (example: eye health)
○ Deepened the analysis of a high-level indicator (example: accessibility of care with different types of health insurance vs. overall health insurance coverage rate; neighborhood-based outcomes vs. citywide)
○ Broadened the framing of an issue area beyond common and stereotypical narratives about a community’s needs (example: justice for survivors of violence and crime)

- **Create accountability for race/ethnicity data collection and analysis across City departments.** Community organizations pointed out that they have repeatedly identified problematic data practices to City departments, but change has been inconsistent and slow. For the Index to be useful, the development process needs to also include intentional coordination among City departments to improve race/ethnicity data practices. Examples cited include:
  ○ Use specific race/ethnicity categories that are meaningful to local communities of color, especially those that have experienced the most harm from white supremacy, colonization, and imperialism
  ○ Increase sample sizes through data collection and transformation to accurately and consistently report on outcomes for American Indians, Pacific Islanders, and other invisibilized communities
  ○ Enable data reporting on different multiracial identities, instead of considering them a monolithic group
  ○ Align interpretation of frequently used population figures and indicators across City departments and community organizations
  ○ Actively develop cultural humility and cultural competency, and recruit and hire data experts who have knowledge about specific communities of color in San Francisco and California.

**An Intentional Process**

The purpose of the Index is to help repair government-sanctioned racial harm. Therefore it is clear that ORE must extend the process and deepen engagement of our communities to fully address these and other concerns before a first version of the Index is released. San Francisco’s first Racial Equity Index must not repeat racial harm. Both the process and the Index need to be created through an intentional and respectful integration of community expertise and City department input.

**The Path Forward**

**A. Community Workshops and Conversations**

ORE will host workshops in the first quarter of 2022 to continue these conversations with community data experts and to outreach to more organizations to capture more perspectives on the Index. The purpose of the workshops will be to review the initial indicators and data, clarify and refine assumptions and methodologies, and surface new quantitative and qualitative data for the Index. Based on findings from the workshops, ORE will adjust the content of the first version of the Index and revise the roadmap for its delivery. The voices of our communities must be seen and heard through the final Index website.
For reference, please see the appendix, which includes examples of data to be reviewed in-depth with community.

**B. Sustainability Plan for the Index**

In parallel, ORE will work with City departments to secure and coordinate resources for the expansion and maintenance of the Index. Elements of the expansion and maintenance plan will need to include resources for: data research, sourcing and analysis; website development and design; data visualization and storytelling; and ongoing community collaboration and oversight of race/ethnicity data practices. The plan will move the Index beyond its current dependence on pro bono labor for many key tasks, and ensure its long-term sustainability and usefulness for the City.

**Conclusion**

As described above, ORE will continue to drive development and the public release of San Francisco’s Racial Equity Index in 2022.

If desired, ORE can host a session for you and your staff to learn more about the Index at your convenience. Thank you for your support as we continue an intentional journey towards racial justice in San Francisco.

Office of Racial Equity  
San Francisco Human Rights Commission  
25 Van Ness Avenue #800  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Website: https://www.racialequitysf.org/
APPENDIX

San Francisco Racial Equity Index: Initial indicators and data concerns

Office of Racial Equity
December 2021
Purpose

These slides provide a snapshot of:

- Initial issue areas and indicators for a San Francisco Racial Equity Index
- Examples of data that has been compiled so far, and why in-depth review with community is needed

In 2022, ORE will:

- Validate data methodology and narratives with community, and refine guiding questions and indicators
- Compile data for additional issue areas and indicators in coordination with City departments
- Release a public website for the San Francisco Racial Equity Index
- Identify longer-term data needs to be addressed
Many data challenges that need to be addressed

Concerns named:
- Data assumptions and methodologies that misrepresent outcomes for specific racial/ethnic groups
- Limited indicators not reflecting the full reality of people’s lives
- Potential for the Index to become a performative “check the box” exercise, rather than a means to create accountability and transparency.

Requests to ORE for next steps before finalizing Index:
- Validate data methodology and narratives with community and establish consistency across City departments
- Report on data for racial/ethnic communities in San Francisco in ways that match their specific histories and experiences, instead of only using high-level Census categories
- Include additional indicators and data sources to increase relevancy
- Create accountability for race/ethnicity data collection and analysis across City departments
# Racial Equity Index - Issue Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue areas with initial data</th>
<th>Issue areas to come</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Housing, homelessness, and land use</td>
<td>• Information technology and digital equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community health and wellness</td>
<td>• Gender justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policing and criminal justice</td>
<td>• Food justice and sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wealth-building, economic justice, and fair employment</td>
<td>• Arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education, knowledge, and community wisdom</td>
<td>• Youth and older adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate, environmental, and transportation justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORE criteria for prioritizing indicators for initial data work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful to community</th>
<th>Useful to City staff</th>
<th>Data readiness</th>
<th>Overall set of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify injustice that community is discussing, advocating, and organizing around</td>
<td>• Presented in a way that is useful for further analysis or decision-making</td>
<td>• Can be used to calculate change over time</td>
<td>• Includes both positive and negative indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Captures historical injustice in community</td>
<td>• Can be used to replace an existing proxy indicator</td>
<td>• Updated regularly, especially annually</td>
<td>• Will show movement within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visible/tangible in people's daily life</td>
<td>• High-quality data is important for City accountability and needs to be developed</td>
<td>• High-quality data available at this time</td>
<td>• Includes indicators that can be moved by public sector, private sector, and non-profit work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in indicator is a movement towards liberation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Includes indicators that can be moved by public sector, private sector, and non-profit work.
### Housing, Homelessness, and Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Who has affordable housing?</th>
<th>Who is receiving housing protection and support?</th>
<th>What is being done to break the cycle of homelessness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized indicators</td>
<td>• Renter rates</td>
<td>• Eviction notices</td>
<td>• Unhoused people (sheltered and unsheltered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ownership rates</td>
<td>• Rate of foreclosures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Median rent and mortgage amounts</td>
<td>• Who is served by different types of housing services, and restrictions on those services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gentrification risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public or community owned land and housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in **bold**
Housing, Homelessness, and Land Use

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Community experts have noted inaccuracies and inconsistencies in how different City departments use American Community Survey data to calculate this

- City lacks race/ethnicity data on evictions. In 2021, neighborhoods with most formal evictions were: Mission (106), SOMA (78), Tenderloin (60), Financial District (45), Outer Richmond (39)
Data issues to address include:

- Community service providers have noted these rates do not match their experiences and observations, and that City departments are reporting different homeownership rates.

- Need to disaggregate Asian, multiracial, and "another race" data with larger sample, given wide disparities within each category.

- Additional work needed to reflect decline in working-class and BIPOC home ownership caused by foreclosure crisis and pandemic.
Housing, Homelessness, and Land Use

*Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022*

Data issues to address include:

- Almost 10,000 people in San Francisco were homeless before COVID-19 pandemic. A full PIT count was not conducted in 2021 (did not include unsheltered people)

- Existing data collection methodology does not allow detail on multiracial people - especially important for American Indian community

- Reflects people observed to be living outdoors or in emergency shelter, and undercounts actual number of people without housing
Housing, Homelessness, and Land Use

- Graphic on left shows data analysis from the American Indian Cultural District with Planning Department on homelessness
- Need to extend this analysis across more communities, and integrate intersectional data on gender identity, sexual orientation, age, and more

American Indian and Black individuals are unhoused disproportionately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK / AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 times</td>
<td>17 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More likely to be unhoused compared to their share of the population.

2019 San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey
# Community Health and Wellness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Who has equitable and affordable access to health care?</th>
<th>How do social, mental, and physical determinants impact health outcomes?</th>
<th>Do San Francisco's children have equitable health outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized indicators</td>
<td>• Health insurance coverage rate</td>
<td>• Leading causes of death</td>
<td>• Students passing physical fitness exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health outcomes and services</td>
<td>• Asthma-related ER visits for children</td>
<td>• Maternal health outcomes and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diabetes rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chronic health problems and disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in bold
Community Health and Wellness
Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Integrate data on types of insurance and “underinsurance” specific to each community. Health insurance does not equal having affordable, reliable, and high-quality healthcare.

- Does not show impact of pandemic, which caused many families to lose employer-based health insurance.
Community Health and Wellness
Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Leading causes of death by race/ethnicity - San Francisco
2019 California Health and Human Services Open Data Portal

Data issues to address include:

- Incorporate sources that reflect health and wellness throughout people's lifetimes (e.g., eyesight)
- Use longer timeframes in order to show data that might otherwise be held due to confidentiality practices, especially for American Indians, Pacific Islanders
- Show intersections of gender identity, age, income, neighborhood
### Policing and Criminal Justice

- **Guiding questions**
  - Who is being policed and incarcerated?
  - How are people being served by the criminal justice system?
  - What are post-incarceration outcomes?

- **Prioritized indicators**
  - **Who is being policed and incarcerated?**
    - Police uses of force
    - Suspension rates for youth
    - Incarceration in federal, state, and county facilities
    - Mental health and other health outcomes during incarceration and institutionalization
    - Juvenile detention rate
  - **How are people being served by the criminal justice system?**
    - Race/ethnicity of judges, public defenders, prosecutors, police
    - Sentence lengths
    - Percentage of arrests vs. charges brought
    - Defendants who have public vs. private defenders
    - Language access availability and cost
  - **What are post-incarceration outcomes?**
    - Outcomes 1 year, 5 years, and 10 years after release
    - Youth previously incarcerated in juvenile detention who return to school

---

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in **bold**.
Policing and Criminal Justice
Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Disaggregate “Other/Unknown” into specific race/ethnicity categories (e.g. American Indian, Arab, Pacific Islander) without violating confidentiality practices
- 2020 City audit outlined process issues causing inaccuracy in reporting on use of force. FPD 96A quarterly reports also do not assess whether force was “justified”
- Allow people to self-identify their race, instead of relying on police assumptions
Policing and Criminal Justice

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data challenges to address include:

- Race/ethnicity data reported to state undercounts the number of American Indian students within SFUSD
- Include additional measures to reflect the “preschool to prison” pipeline
- Integrate data on students with disabilities - within every racial group, students with disabilities were suspended at a higher rate

**Ratio of suspension rate vs. enrollment rate - San Francisco**

2019-20 California Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Latino or Hispanic</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of suspensions</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of student suspensions vs. percentage of student enrollment
### Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

**Guiding questions**

- What assets, savings, and equity do people have?
- What access to banking, financing do people have?
- Who is making a dignified wage? What does workplace quality and safety look like?
- What does worker representation and business ownership look like?

**Prioritized indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What assets, savings, and equity do people have?</th>
<th>What access to banking, financing do people have?</th>
<th>Who is making a dignified wage? What does workplace quality and safety look like?</th>
<th>What does worker representation and business ownership look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Households living in poverty</td>
<td>• Mortgage application outcomes</td>
<td>• Median wages</td>
<td>• Participation in labor unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Savings amounts and types</td>
<td>• Savings and checking account holders</td>
<td>• Employment by occupation</td>
<td>• Business ownership and average revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retirement savings</td>
<td>• Banking deserts and predatory lenders</td>
<td>• CCSF employee wages and occupational segregation</td>
<td>• Business loans provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home equity and appraisal amounts</td>
<td>• Credit scores</td>
<td>• Unemployment/underemployment rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in **bold**
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data challenges to address include:

- Review against similar analysis for different departments
- Disaggregate Asian, “another race” data as much as possible given known disparities within each category
- Reflect frequency and scale of wage theft, labor violations
- Integrate measures on age, gender, immigration history, English proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual median wage</th>
<th>Median wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native (alone and in)</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native (alone)</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Race</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment
Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

A quarter of San Francisco residents make $118,000 per year or more (75th percentile).

Data issues to address include:

- Does not show impact of job loss during COVID-19 pandemic.
- Broaden timeframe to reflect that racial income gap in San Francisco is widening.
- Disaggregate data further, including by occupation type.

Race/ethnicity of people paid more than $118k/year - San Francisco

2019 American Community Survey (5-Year Estimate)

Race/ethnicity of people paid more than $118k/year

A quarter of San Francisco residents make $118,000 per year or more (75th percentile).

Data issues to address include:

- Does not show impact of job loss during COVID-19 pandemic.
- Broaden timeframe to reflect that racial income gap in San Francisco is widening.
- Disaggregate data further, including by occupation type.
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment
Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Median Income for Black Households is less than one fourth of White Households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>$104,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>$61,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>$30,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx (Any Race)</td>
<td>$72,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>$76,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>$59,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>$114,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>$132,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2018 5-year American Community Survey

- Graphic on left illustrates analysis from Planning Department for a slightly different time frame (2018 5-Year Estimate) and slightly different basis (households) than initial data compiled for Index.
- Need to discuss different approaches with community and establish consistent narrative.
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

**ESTIMATED SF UNEMPLOYMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td>840,763</td>
<td>850,282</td>
<td>864,263</td>
<td>870,044</td>
<td>874,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment - Citywide</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Two or More Races</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (of Any Race)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*

- Graphic on left illustrates analysis from OEWD for unemployment rates.
- Need to validate underlying population estimates with community and update with race/ethnicity categories to be used in final Index.
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate Asian, multiracial categories
- Incorporate data on amount applied for, withdrawn applications, financial institutions
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Combine data across years in order to report on categories with very few employees (e.g., Pacific Islanders) while adhering to confidentiality practices
- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate Asian, multiracial categories
Wealth-Building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Combine data across years in order to report on categories with very few employees (e.g., American Indians, Pacific Islanders) while adhering to confidentiality practices.

- Disaggregate within each EEO job code, and incorporate other dimensions, such as age, years of employment, and more.
## Education, Knowledge, and Community Wisdom

### Guiding questions
- Before traditional education begins, how are students doing in their First Five Years?
- Where are there gaps in the traditional K-12 education system?
- What types of opportunities are students able to access after traditional schooling?
- What does adult and continuing education look like?

### Prioritized indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized indicators</th>
<th>Before traditional education begins, how are students doing in their First Five Years?</th>
<th>Where are there gaps in the traditional K-12 education system?</th>
<th>What types of opportunities are students able to access after traditional schooling?</th>
<th>What does adult and continuing education look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Students enrolled in preschool by age 4</td>
<td>● Students meeting Language Arts and Math standards</td>
<td>● Community college graduation and transfer rates</td>
<td>● Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High quality child care availability</td>
<td>● Chronic absenteeism</td>
<td>● Students who meet CSU/UC requirements</td>
<td>● Student loan debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Race/ethnicity of teachers vs. students at schools</td>
<td>● Participation in City or union apprenticeship programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in **bold**
Education, Knowledge, and Community Wisdom

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Race/ethnicity data reported to state undercounts the number of American Indian students within SFUSD
- Combine data across years to report on categories with relatively few students (e.g. American Indians) while adhering to confidentiality practices
- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate categories further
Education, Knowledge, and Community Wisdom

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate American Indian, Asian, multiracial categories

- Determine specific root causes for missing class days, instead of perpetuating stereotypes about students of color. Initial data suggests chronic absenteeism in San Francisco is almost double statewide averages
# Climate, Environmental, and Transportation Justice

## Guiding questions

- Who is protected from pollution?
- Who is living in areas with access to green space?
- Who has access to reliable and clean energy?
- Who has access to reliable transportation?

## Prioritized indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollution exposure:</th>
<th>People living near high-quality green space</th>
<th>Energy cost burden and utility debt</th>
<th>Street conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Air pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solid waste sites and facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Groundwater threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Toxic clean up sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tree coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial data has been compiled for indicators in **bold**
Climate, Environmental, and Transportation Justice

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Integrate additional dimensions, such as gender, wage/income, and job type to yield more insights, while maintaining confidentiality for individual employees

- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate Asian, multiracial categories

City employee county of residence by race/ethnicity

2021

- Multiracial: 55% (San Francisco), 13% (San Mateo), 12% (Alameda), 9% (Contra Costa), 2% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- Asian (not including Filipino): 55% (San Francisco), 21% (San Mateo), 12% (Alameda), 12% (Contra Costa), 6% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 40% (San Francisco), 12% (San Mateo), 11% (Alameda), 15% (Contra Costa), 6% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- White: 40% (San Francisco), 17% (San Mateo), 14% (Alameda), 10% (Contra Costa), 2% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- Latino: 37% (San Francisco), 22% (San Mateo), 12% (Alameda), 17% (Contra Costa), 4% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- Black: 33% (San Francisco), 6% (San Mateo), 21% (Alameda), 21% (Contra Costa), 11% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
- Filipino: 25% (San Francisco), 39% (San Mateo), 9% (Alameda), 16% (Contra Costa), 6% (Solano), 1% (Marin), 1% (Sonoma), 1% (Santa Clara), 1% (San Joaquin), 1% (Sacramento), 1% (Stanislaus), 1% (Napa)
Climate, Environmental, and Transportation Justice

Example data that requires review and validation with community in 2022

Data issues to address include:

- Refine assumptions underlying both the pollution burden estimates and population estimates
- Identify supplemental sources and/or processes to disaggregate Asian, multiracial categories
- Incorporate visualizations by neighborhood. Treasure Island, SOMA, Bayview and the Presidio census tracts have very high clean-up site scores, especially Treasure Island
Examples of additional racial equity indicators considered during research phase
## Housing, Homelessness, and Land Use

### Additional indicators considered

#### Guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has affordable housing?</th>
<th>Who is receiving tenant protection and support?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of RHNA target built for current cycle, split by permit type</td>
<td>Gap between 30% of monthly AMI and average monthly rent of 1-bedroom, by neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current funding available vs. total funding needed to meet affordable housing need, by neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term residential vacancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional indicators considered

- % of RHNA target built for current cycle, split by permit type
- Current funding available vs. total funding needed to meet affordable housing need, by neighborhood
- Long-term residential vacancies
## Community Health and Wellness

### Additional indicators considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Who has equitable and affordable access to health care?</th>
<th>How do social, mental, and physical determinants impact health outcomes?</th>
<th>Do San Francisco’s children have equitable health outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID-19 vaccination by race</td>
<td>Life expectancy</td>
<td>Kindergarten cavities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER visits</td>
<td>HIV diagnoses</td>
<td>Child SNAP recipiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidable hospitalizations</td>
<td>Psychiatric hospitalizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additional indicators considered
  - COVID-19 vaccination by race
  - ER visits
  - Avoidable hospitalizations
  - Life expectancy
  - HIV diagnoses
  - Psychiatric hospitalizations
  - Physical activity
  - Kindergarten cavities
  - Child SNAP recipiency
## Policing and Criminal Justice

### Additional indicators considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Who is being policed and incarcerated?</th>
<th>How are people being served by the criminal justice system?</th>
<th>What are post-incarceration outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional indicators considered</td>
<td>● Police stops and searches &lt;br&gt; ● Arrests and interactions by zip code, including median income for each zip code</td>
<td>● Enrollment in SF Pretrial Diversion Project &lt;br&gt; ● Usage of alternative policing programs &lt;br&gt; ● Crimes classified as violent</td>
<td>● Housing providers &quot;notice of prospective adverse action&quot; based on criminal history &lt;br&gt; ● Education outcomes of youth whose parents are justice system-involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Wealth-building, Economic Justice, and Fair Employment

### Additional indicators considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>What assets, savings, and equity do people have?</th>
<th>Who is making a dignified wage? What does workplace quality and safety look like?</th>
<th>What does worker representation and business ownership look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Additional indicators considered | ● Average inheritance  
● Additional poverty measures  
● Surplus income available | ● Growth rate of wages  
● Contractors vs FTEs  
● Parental leave  
● Employment tenure  
● High-risk jobs/high COVID exposure jobs | ● Impact of COVID on business types  
● Worker cooperatives  
● Availability of start up funding |
## Education, Knowledge, and Community Wisdom

### Additional indicators considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Before traditional education begins, how are students doing in their First Five Years?</th>
<th>Where are there gaps in the traditional K-12 education system?</th>
<th>What types of opportunities are students able to access after traditional schooling?</th>
<th>What does adult and continuing education look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of books in household</td>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>Higher education by type (private, public, trade, 2- and 4-year)</td>
<td>Average income based on education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental well-being</td>
<td>STEM degrees</td>
<td>Education loan repayment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caring adult at school</td>
<td>Net tuition</td>
<td>Community cultural centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Climate, Environmental, and Transportation Justice

**Additional indicators considered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Who is protected from pollution?</th>
<th>Who has access to reliable and clean energy?</th>
<th>Who has access to reliable transportation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal dumping service requests</td>
<td>• Rooftop solar availability</td>
<td>• Mean travel time to work/ extreme commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation in green jobs workforce and in workforce development programs</td>
<td>• Access to a car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public EV charging locations</td>
<td>• Location of curb ramps and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment in waste and energy sector by seniority (front line vs. back office)</td>
<td>• Safety and accidents for people walking or biking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>