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## I. Introduction

The Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), an advisory board to the Board of Supervisors of San Mateo County, seeks to improve the quality of life for women of all ages in San Mateo County. Through strategic partnerships and collaboration, the Commission identifies women's needs, advises the Board of Supervisors, and educates the community on matters concerning women.

Boards and commissions involve members of the San Mateo County community in assisting the Board of Supervisors in making sound decisions relating to County policy and governance. A number of the boards and commissions are responsible for allocating and overseeing County funded budgets, and some have final decision-making powers that directly impact the lives of citizens in the County.

This analysis is conducted to evaluate the degree to which the makeup of San Mateo County boards and commissions is gender representative of the community as a whole.

## II. Methodology

The County currently has thirty-three advisory and decision-making boards and commissions, not including regional associations run by other government agencies. Gender information was collected for each of these bodies. The data can be found in the Appendix of this report.

This analysis is a snapshot of the membership of San Mateo County advisory boards and commissions at the time of the 2013 roster's publication in December, 2012 with data collected through survey responses obtained in November, 2013. The primary resources for this report are:

- The Roster Boards and Commissions 2013, published by the County in December 2012;
- Survey results from each board or commission's contact person in November 2013;
- San Mateo County's Boards and Commissions Handbook.

The board and commissions roster is publicly available online at http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/Attachments/bnc/pdfs/Rosters/rptCommissions.pdf. The roster provides member lists, board function, and other membership information about each board and commission in the County and region. This comprehensive publication is updated annually to reflect the most current information available.

In addition to the data available in this roster, a survey was conducted via email to the staff of Boards and Commissions asking for the number of men, women, and vacancies on each board and commission. Of the thirty-three boards and commissions, thirty-three responded with the gender count, resulting in a $100 \%$ response rate.

Additional information for this gender analysis was gathered from San Mateo County's Boards and Commissions Handbook, which can be found on the web at http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/Attachments/bnc/pdfs/BnCHandbook.pdf. This handbook gives an overview of the role boards and commissions play in the County.

The Gender Analysis of San Francisco Commissions and Boards prepared by the City and County of San Francisco in August, 2009 was used as a reference. This report can be found online at http://www.sfgov3.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/dosw/programs/CEDAW/documents/GenderAnalysisOfCommissions 2009 REV 09.09.09.pdf. This gender analysis guideline provided a helpful frame of reference for this report.

## III. Gender Analysis Guidelines

For the purposes of this report, gender analysis is defined as follows:
Gender analysis is concerned with examining public policies and their outcomes through a gender lens. It focuses on the differences in women's and men's lives, including those which lead to social and economic inequity for women, and applies this understanding to public policy development, service delivery, workforce issues, and budget allocations in the effort to achieve gender parity. ${ }^{1}$

This gender analysis report will provide insight as to whether the membership of the San Mateo County advisory boards and commissions are reflective of the gender demographics of the County.

## IV. Background on San Mateo County Boards and Commissions

The boards and commissions of San Mateo County have a wide spectrum of purposes and serve a multitude of communities. Some boards and commissions have decision-making authority, some are purely advisory, while others represent a particular community interest. The amount of compensation allocated to members of advisory boards and commissions ranges from $\$ 0$ to $\$ 300$ per meeting.

## V. County Demographic Background Information

San Mateo County is a significant part of the San Francisco bay area, reaching from Pacifica and Daly City to East Palo Alto and Pescadero. The population within the region is diverse in terms of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

[^0]Gender demographics for San Mateo County according to 2010 US Census are included below. ${ }^{2}$

| Total population | $\mathbf{7 1 8 , 4 5 1}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 353,168 | $49.2 \%$ |
| Female | 365,283 | $50.8 \%$ |

These figures show that the gender split in the county is almost equal.
Below is the gender breakdown of San Mateo County in comparison with the gender breakdown of the advisory boards and commissions.


While there are $1.6 \%$ more women than men in San Mateo County, there are $12.0 \%$ more women than men participating on San Mateo County's boards and commissions.

## VI. Gender Analysis Data

As of December 2012, the County of San Mateo had thirty-three advisory boards and commissions.
Of these boards and commissions, there were:

- 399 filled seats;
- 59 vacancies;
- $225(56 \%)$ active seats held by women.

The graph below shows the number of gender-balanced, over-represented, and under-represented advisory boards and commissions. This is considered gender balanced by our definition.

## Distribution of Boards and Commissions



For the purposes of this analysis, "Balanced," "Over Represented," and "Under-represented" are defined as follows:

- Balanced: between $40-60 \%$ female members.
- Over represented: $61 \%$ or more female members.
- Under-represented: $39 \%$ or fewer female members.


## A. Decision Making Boards and Commissions

Half of the decision making boards and commissions are balanced in terms of gender makeup.

| Commission | Percent Female <br> Members | Compensation |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |$|$| Design Review Committee | $40 \%$ | Yes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Planning Commission | $40 \%$ | Yes |
| Workforce Investment Board | $43 \%$ |  |

Half of the decision making boards and commissions are underrepresented with women. Three of the five bodies which receive compensation are underrepresented with women. The Assessment Appeals Board has no female members.

| Commission | Percent Female <br> Members | Compensation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## B. Gender Balanced Advisory Boards and Commissions

Of the thirty-three advisory boards and commissions, thirteen are gender balanced.

| Commission | Percent Female <br> Members | Compensation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agricultural Advisory Committee | $45 \%$ | None |
| Commission on Disabilities | $53 \%$ | None |
| Confined Animal Technical Advisory Committee | $57 \%$ | None |
| Design Review Committee | $40 \%$ | Yes |
| Emergency Medical Care Committee | $41 \%$ | None |
| HOPE | $58 \%$ | None |
| Housing and Community Development Committee | $43 \%$ | None |
| Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | $43 \%$ | None |
| North Fair Oaks Municipal Advisory Council | $55 \%$ | None |
| Planning Commission | $40 \%$ | Yes |
| Treasury Oversight Committee | $50 \%$ | None |
| Workforce Investment Board | $43 \%$ | None |
| Youth Commission | $60 \%$ | None |

## C. Gender Imbalanced Advisory Boards and Commissions

Of the thirty-three advisory boards and commissions, twenty are gender imbalanced. Eight have a disproportionate number of male members, and twelve have a disproportionate number of female members.

## Commissions With Disproportionate Number of Male Members

| Commission | Percent <br> Female Members | Compensation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessment Appeals Board | 0\% | Yes |
| Board of Building Permit Appeals | 25\% | Yes |
| Civil Service Commission | 20\% | Yes |
| Emergency Services Council | 38\% | None |
| Fatherhood Collaborative | 36\% | None |
| Midcoast Community Council | 28\% | None |
| Parks and Recreation Commission | 0\% | None |
| Pescadero Municipal Community Advisory Council | 22\% | None |

The membership of Midcoast Community Council - $28 \%$ and the Pescadero Municipal Community Advisory Council - 22\% are elected positions that can be held by a registered voter who lives in the respective area.

## Commissions With Disproportionate Number of Female Members

| Commission | Percent <br> Female Members | Compensation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | None | Arts Commission | $75 \%$ | None |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Children's Collaborative Action Team/ San Mateo <br> County Child Abuse Prevention Council | $67 \%$ | None |
| Colma Creek Citizens Advisory Committee | $71 \%$ | None |
| Commission on Aging | $88 \%$ | None |
| Commission on the Status of Women | $100 \%$ | None |
| Domestic Violence Council | $68 \%$ | None |
| First 5 San Mateo County | $87 \%$ | None |
| In-Home Supportive Services | $83 \%$ | None |
| Juvenile Justice \& Delinquency Prevention Council | $70 \%$ | None |
| Mental Health \& Substance Abuse Commission | $73 \%$ | None |
| San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council | $77 \%$ |  |
| San Mateo Medical Center Board of Directors | $78 \%$ |  |

## VII. Comparison of 2011/2012/2013

Gender participation of advisory and decision making boards and commissions county wide:

|  | Male | Female | Vacant | Total | \% Active <br> Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $182(45.3 \%)$ | $220(54.7 \%)$ | 63 | 465 | $54.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $181(45.7 \%)$ | $215(54.3 \%)$ | 57 | 453 | $54.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $174(43.6 \%)$ | $225(56.3 \%)$ | 59 | 399 | $56.3 \%$ |

After remaining virtually unchanged between 2011 and 2012 ( $4 \%$ change), there was a 2 percent increase in female participation in 2013.

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Over Represented | $11(33.3 \%)$ | $12(36.4 \%)$ | $12(36.4 \%)$ |
| Balanced | $11(33.3 \%)$ | $9(27.2 \%)$ | $13(39.4 \%)$ |
| Under Represented | $11(33.3 \%)$ | $12(36.4 \%)$ | $8(24.2 \%)$ |

The graph below shows the percentage of gender-balanced, over-represented, and under-represented advisory boards and commissions for the years 2011, 2012, and 2013.


After a 2.1\% increase in 2012, the over representation is stable at $36.4 \%$.
The underrepresented advisory bodies have declined $12.2 \%$ in 2013 after a modest increase of $3.1 \%$ in 2012.

There is an increase of $12.2 \%$ in 2013 after a drop of $6.1 \%$ in 2012.

## VIII. Noteworthy Trends

Ten percent ( $10 \%$ ) or greater variation in 2012 versus 2013 percentage points is considered noteworthy for the purpose of this report. The following Boards and Commissions reported a ten percent ( $10 \%$ ) or greater variation in membership between 2012 and 2013:

| Board or Commission | Increase in Female Participation (Active Members) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\underline{2012}$ | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{\text { Variance }}$ |
| Agricultural Advisory Committee | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 8 \%}$ |
| Colma Creek Citizens Advisory Committee | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 7 \%}$ |
| Fatherhood Collaborative | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 6 \%}$ |
| First 5 San Mateo County | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 7 \%}$ |
| Juvenile Justice \& Delinquency Prevention Commission | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 4 \%}$ |
| North Fair Oaks Municipal Advisory Council | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 2 \%}$ |
| Planning Commission | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 5 \%}$ |
| San Mateo Medical Center Board of Directors | $\mathbf{6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 1 \%}$ |
| Treasury Oversight Committee | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 2 \%}$ |

Six Advisory Boards and/or Commissions had less than $10 \%$ variation and therefore are not listed above.

Board or Commission Reduction in Female Participation (Active Members)

|  | $\underline{2012}$ | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{\text { Variance }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Children's Collaborative Action Team/SM Child Abuse | $78 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-\mathbf{- 1 1 \%}$ |
| Civil Service Commission | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 \%}$ |
| Commission on Disabilities | $63 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 \%}$ |
| Design Review Committee | $50 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 \%}$ |
| Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | $\mathbf{6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 4 \%}$ |
| Parks and Recreation Commission | $20 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 \%}$ |

The greatest change was seen in the Civil Service Commission, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, and the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Six Advisory Boards and/or Commissions had less than $10 \%$ variation and are therefore not listed above.

## IX. Recommendations

The Commission on the Status of Women is pleased to report that the overall gender mix of county boards and commissions is in line with the general population of the County. More can be done by pursuing the following recommendations:

## 1) Reevaluate the language used to promote each board and commission.

It is recommended that all descriptions promoting or pertaining to the boards and commissions use genderneutral language. In particular, the description of the requirements for the Assessment Appeals Board ( $0 \%$ female) can be reworded so that it does not include the word "he" in describing membership.

## 2) Increase outreach to Boards and Commissions with a $30 \%$ or less gender divide.

Boards or Commissions with less than $30 \%$ membership of either gender should make a point of reaching out to a broader segment of the San Mateo County in order to create opportunities for qualified male and female applicants from a variety of backgrounds and experiences. The Commission is available to assist with getting the word out about vacancies. There should be particular outreach to women to participate in decision-making boards and commissions where women are under-represented.

## 3) Encourage the voluntary collection of gender data from the boards and commissions.

The Commission on the Status of Women is willing to coordinate this annual analysis in order to develop longitudinal data that can be analyzed for trends and seeks support from the Board of Supervisors in encouraging all County Boards and Commissions to actively participate in the annual gender analysis by answering survey questions once a year.

## 4) Continue to improve the promotion of vacancies to a wider audience.

By establishing a consistent method of recruiting for all Boards and Commissions the County would provide more visibility to the wide array of opportunities for civic engagement available to the public of either gender. This will facilitate greater community involvement and awareness. The commission applauds the efforts that have led to the development of web pages for Boards and Commissions that are easily searchable by users within our community. The GovDelivery e-mail notification service is a good mechanism to announce vacancies to a list of potentially interested subscribers. This e-mail notification service, which is highlighted on the County's homepage, could include a specific RSS feed for Board and Commission vacancies.

## X. Conclusion

This analysis has shown that women have a higher rate of membership on San Mateo County boards and commissions than in the general population. However, decision-making boards and commissions have an under-representation of female members. The Commission encourages efforts to expand the outreach for vacancies for all advisory bodies and particularly those with predominantly male or female members to increase awareness and to offer greater opportunities for participation.

## APPENDIX

## San Mateo County Boards and Commissions 2013

| DECISION MAKING BOARDS | Compensation | Total <br> Members | Number Male | Number <br> Female | Vacant | Percent Women (Active) Members |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessment Appeals Board | \$300 per meeting | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Board of Building Permit Appeals | \$50 per meeting | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 25\% |
| Civil Service Commission | \$50 per meeting | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20\% |
| Design Review Committee | \$50 per meeting | 9 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 40\% |
| Planning Commission | \$200 per month | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 40\% |
| Workforce Investment Board | None | 29 | 16 | 12 | 1 | 43\% |
| Sub-total |  | 58 | 34 | 18 | 6 | 35\% |

## ADVISORY BOARDS

| Agricultural Advisory Committee | None | 11 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 45\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arts Commission | None | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 75\% |
| Children's Collaborative Action Team / San Mateo County Child Abuse Prevention Council | None | 13 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 67\% |
| Colma Creek Citizens Advisory Committee | None | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 71\% |
| Commission on Aging | None | 21 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 88\% |
| Commission on Disabilities | None | 21 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 53\% |
| Commission on the Status of Women | None | 19 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 100\% |
| Confined Animal Technical Advisory Committee | None | 9 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 57\% |
| Domestic Violence Council | None | 20 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 68\% |
| Emergency Medical Care Committee | None | 21 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 41\% |
| Emergency Services Council | None | 21 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 38\% |
| Fatherhood Collaborative | None | 17 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 36\% |
| First 5 San Mateo County | None | 8 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 87\% |
| HOPE "Housing Our People Effectively" | None | 25 | 10 | 14 | 1 | 58\% |
| Housing and Community Development Committee | None | 17 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 43\% |
| In-Home Supportive Services | None | 11 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 83\% |
| Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | None | 17 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 43\% |
| Juvenile Justice \& Delinquency Prevention Commission | None | 15 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 70\% |


| Mental Health and Substance Abuse | None | 19 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 73\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recovery Commission |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midcoast Community Council | None | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 28\% |
| North Fair Oaks Municipal Advisory Council | None | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 55\% |
| Parks and Recreation Commission | None | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
| Pescadero Municipal Community Advisory Council | None | 15 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 22\% |
| San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council | None | 22 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 77\% |
| San Mateo Medical Center Board of Directors | None | 9 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 78\% |
| Treasury Oversight Committee | None | 8 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 50\% |
| Youth Commission | None | 25 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 60\% |
| Sub-total |  | 400 | 140 | 207 | 53 | 60\% |
| TOTAL |  | 458 | 174 | 225 | 59 | 56\% |


[^0]:    1 "Department on the Status of Women: Gender Analysis Guidelines," Published by City and County of San Francisco, July 2008

