



Request for Information Response

Gender-Based Analysis

Section 1. Background on Organization

TrueChild is a network of experts and researchers that helps grantees and policymakers address gender through “intersectional” approaches that connect it with factors like race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender identity. TrueChild is especially interested in structural inequality, and the impact of gender norms on at-risk youth, like those who are of color, low-income, or LGBTQ.

TrueChild conducts Gender Audits of programs and policies; provides in-depth training for professionals on using a stronger gender lens; and produces regular white paper reports on the impact of gender in public policies and programming. For instance, TrueChild recently conducted Gender Audits of two of the largest juvenile probation and foster care systems in the U.S. One of TrueChild’s model programs to help keep low-income girls in STEM is currently being piloted in the East San Jose public middle schools.

TrueChild has trained or partnered with such agencies as the White House, CDC, Office on Women’s Health, Office of Adolescent Health, CA Department of Public Health, and the DC Mayor’s Office, as well as national and regional networks like the Association of Black Foundation Executives, Hispanics in Philanthropy (HIP), San Diego Grantmakers, Southern California Grantmakers, and Women’s Funding Network. TrueChild has also done human right projects supported by the US Human Rights Funders Network.

Section 2. Scope & Methodology

A. Priorities

If funding is limited, data collection should prioritize current rather than retrospective and/or trend data, departmental work should prioritize funding to citizen-facing and service-delivery departments over internal ones (i.e., Housing *versus* Finance). More generally, departments should be taught to collect their own data and rather than relying on outside services. Final data could be stored onsite instead of secured on “the cloud.” And any gender equity training, could utilize a *train-the-trainers* model, one which promotes teaching key individuals within the City of San Jose how to train their colleagues rather than relying on the services of outside consultants. Having City personnel be the institutional memory for gender expertise will also provide major advantages to the City once the Gender Analysis is complete and consultants have moved on, as new staff need to be on-boarded and trained in more equitable practice.

B. Data Collection

The proposed Analysis would request City departments to collect data in five main categories if analyzed. Each should provide not only disaggregation by sex, but also race, immigration status, parental status, language, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, age, as well as *gender identity*. This would make for a truly intersectional approach, one that is consistent with the spirit and letter of CEDAW’s goals. Questions below are only provided as examples, and not an exhaustive list for all data to be collected. In addition, because decades of research have established that normative attitudes about gender are a primary factor in gender inequality, in some sections data collection about masculine and feminine norms is also recommended.

i. Services & Programs

- a. What programs are provided by department or allied community groups which may disparately affect women, men, or gender nonconforming persons?
- b. Have program enrollment or use over the last 10 years varied for women, men, and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming persons? What trends are anticipated for the next 10 years?
- c. Do any programs focus on women and girls, LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals, and are programs and services working to engage each of these groups?
- d. Do programs and/or services address issues of sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender nonconformity?
- e. Do programs address the impact of rigid masculine or feminine norms where appropriate?
- f. How were women and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals involved in program development and delivery?
- g. Are women, men, and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals engaged in evaluating programs and services provided to them or which affect them?
- h. Do services and programs serving women or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals take into account sexual and domestic violence against them?

ii. Policies & Planning

- a. What policies do or don't account for disparate impact on women, men, and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming persons?
- b. How are women and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals involved in policy development?
- c. How does the departmental Strategic Plan (if any) account for disparately impact on women, men and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals?
- d. How were women, LBGTQ, and gender nonconforming individuals involved in Strategic Planning development and/or implementation?
- e. Does the Strategic Plans take into account the impact of rigid gender norms where appropriate?
- f. Are there policies that address the specific needs of transitioning individuals, and are policies in place to ensure that facilities and programs are welcoming for all transgender and gender nonconforming individuals?
- g. Are women, men, and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals engaged in evaluating programs and services provided to them or which affect them?

iii. Budgeting

A. Is gender as a unit of analysis integrated as a unit of analysis integrated into annual budgetary audit, and do budgeting categories provide for LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals?

b. Do budgeting guidelines and/or priorities address how funding or cuts might differentially affect women, men, or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals.

c. Are there programs or services which differentially affect women, men, or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals, or are most important to advancing gender equity, and if so, how are budgetary allocations for them programs handled?

d. If additional budget resources were made available, where could budget allocations be shifted to improve gender equity?

iv. Employment

a. Are women, men, or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals disproportionately represented in certain jobs or at specific pay grades within the organization, or absent from others. Do they tend to exit positions more quickly than others, and if so, is gender a category of analysis in exit interviews?

b. Are women, men, or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals paid the same for the same or similar jobs, do they tend to advance at different rates due to seniority or work-life policies, and are they equally represented across management, including at the top levels?

c. Are there any job qualifications that might disproportionately favor or disfavor women, men, or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming employees, including work-life policies? Are there job recruitment efforts that might disproportionately favor or disfavor them as well?

d. What policies and practices has the department implemented to better retain women or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals at all levels of the organization?

e. Are existing work-life balance policies taken advantage of equally by women, men, and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming employees? Are there any changes which might help promote more equitable use of these policies, or minimize any real or perceived negative impact related to taking advantage of them and the associated related career interruption?

f. Is training mandated for employees on identifying, preventing, and responding to gender-based workplace harassment, including harassment related to real or perceived gender identity and/or sexual orientation? Is such training a mandated part of on-boarding new employees?

g. Is there regularly auditing of the annual hiring, retention, and promotion of women or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals?

v. Training & Professional Development

- a. Is regular training or PD offered to help employees better understand the impact of rigid gender norms on service and program delivery or employment and retention of women or LGBTQ and gender nonconforming individuals?
- b. Is specific training provided to ensure welcoming work environments and programming or services for transgender or gender nonconforming individuals who may be transitioning?
- c. Are women and LGBTQ or gender nonconforming individuals engaged in identifying what PD is needed, in designing PD, or in their delivery?

C. Data Organization & Storage

There is no one-size-fits-all solution to the question of data storage. Factors to be considered include (but are not limited to):

- Projected long- and short-term budget;
- Capacity of existing data management staff;
- Existing data query software;
- Need for data security and backup;
- Total current size and projected future size of data set (are annual data sets anticipated, and if so, would they be added to or simply replace existing data); and,
- Integration and compatibility with other query and reporting software.

The need for any combination of strong security, interoperability with a variety of data query and report generation software, strong backup and redundancy, and unlimited storage expansion have led many to use Amazon's S3 (Simple Storage Service). It is the choice of many researchers for NIH-funded studies with large data sets, and has also been adopted by departments throughout the US government, including the military. IBM's Cloud service would be a good choice as well. "Cloud" storage solutions would not require the City to acquire additional hardware or software, nor would they use up any of the City's own computing services. They also integrate instantaneous backups, so data is never be lost, and are highly secure environments to maintain sensitive data.

In general, we recommend data collected be stored in a standard, relational database structure which is SQL-compatible. Structured Query Language or SQL is the most widely used software for large data sets, because it allows non-technical staff to readily ask questions of and/or produce reports from data, by posing English-like queries that require no programming knowledge and little technical expertise.

D. Implementation of Findings

It is difficult to recommend steps for implementing the findings in advance of the findings. In general, it is best to form some sort of standing committee or team tasked with overseeing implementation of findings. This group should report regularly to and be responsible to a higher management level. It is generally advisable to develop concrete goals— both for the process of the analysis and for the implementation of its recommendation, so both progress and shortcomings can be quickly identified, and/or addressed.

It is also generally good practice that organizations undergoing gender audits or analyses set down at the beginning of their desired goals and the outcomes they expect. Specifying this in

advance and putting it down in writing, even before data collection is undertaken, can help guide the process, and serve as a constant point of reference for all involved.

We have found that familiarity with gender, as well as enthusiasm for implementing gender analyses and audits, can be unevenly distributed across organizations. To make sure everyone is on the same page, prior to data collection, we often suggest a series of Gender 101 trainings, that take employees and management through the basic ideas of gender, terms and definitions (gender, gender identity, gender mainstreaming, gender equity, cisgender, nonbinary, etc.), findings from some key studies, why gender equity is important, and what to expect from a gender analysis.

We often find this builds both knowledge and buy-in, often improves the value and accuracy of the data collected, and also paves the way for more effective implementation of findings. Gender norms, beliefs, and inequities are pervasive and challenging. In our experience, implementing gender equity at every level is not an end-point, but a process of continual improvement.

E. Previous Models

Other than the Gender Analysis conducted by the City and County of San Francisco, Department on the Status of Women, we are regrettably unaware of any previous models.

F. Expectations

We are regrettably unable to provide any RFPs for government gender analyses which clearly explain expectations. In addition to the materials from the City and County of San Francisco, another useful resource might also be the general guide to gender analyses published by the UN Development Program (UNPD), available online at <http://tinyurl.com/UNDP-GenderAnalysis>.

G. Budget

It is difficult to recommend a budget in advance of knowing more details of what, exactly, the final analysis will consist of, which departments will be included, how and where the data will be stored, the implementation plan, and how much data collection will be conducted by City departments themselves. With that said, exclusive of any costs for cloud storage, we believe the entire project could be done for between \$300,000 and \$400,000.

Please contact me personally with any questions whatsoever. Thank you for this opportunity to reply to the RFI. We think wide adoption and implantation of CEDAW by US institutions is both salutary and overdue, and wish you the best of luck in doing so.

Sincerely yours,



Riki Wilchins, Executive Director
rwilchins@truechild.org