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I. COMMUNITIES OF OPPORTUNITY

A. Pilot Phase Business Plan—2006-2010

Source: The Bridgespan Group in collaboration with city administration

Release Date: May 2006

Overview: Communities of Opportunity (COO) unique place-based strategy of renewal that hopes to transform high need neighborhoods by changing the way the City, residents, community-based organizations, foundations, and the private sector do business. The initial pilot areas are located on four corners in the Southeast sector of the city.

The COO strategy was developed by a steering committee of 13 departmental and agency directors. The committee analyzed available data on the current conditions and state of services in the identified areas, reviewed community revitalization practices locally and nationally, and engaged community residents to seek direction on priorities and feedback on proposed initiatives.

Key Findings: Several key themes came from community feedback about the project: there is a high level of skepticism that change can occur given that attempts have been made again and again in these neighborhoods; community improvement needs to focus on both increased safety given the high prevalence of violence and upgrades to the physical environment; jobs and programs for youth are the highest priority needs; the city must make a long-term commitment to change indicated by a sustained presence in the target areas; communication between the city and community needs to be more consistent; and city agencies and community organizations need to be more accountable for delivering results.

Eight priority outcomes are the focus of the first two years of the COO initiative. 1) adults find employment, 2) safety is established, 3) economic development provides direct benefits, 4) chronic crisis families and individuals receive integrated crisis services, 5) physical infrastructure is improved, 6) children and youth access educational enrichment and employment, 7) social networks are strong and institutions support transformation, 8) partnership between city, residents and other stakeholders is established.

Recommendations: With respect to increasing safety and reducing violence in the target neighborhoods 4 specific strategies are recommended.

- Public safety agencies will build partnerships with community residents and expand resources. (Establish a public safety fund for each neighborhood, strengthen police resources.)
- Break the cycle of youth engagement by providing positive pathways. (Target employment and enrichment programs to at-risk youth, pilot new approaches to juvenile probation, and introduce a community response network that replicates one in the Mission.)
- Create a safer physical environment (reduce litter, improve lighting, install safety cameras, install traffic calming devices and cameras, increase code enforcement, etc.).
- Public safety agencies will engage in a sustained effort to analyze crime patterns and deter criminal activity (track and analyze data, enhance enforcement of criminal and civil violations like vandalism and drug trafficking, and strengthen deterrents of violent behavior.

**B. Final Report of Community Voices Project**

**Source/Author:** National Community Develop Initiative

**Release Date:** May 2006

**Overview:** The Community Voices Project was designed to bring forth the voices and involvement of community residents in the implementation of the Communities of Opportunity (COO) pilot phase. The specific intent was to engage community residents, obtain their input about community needs and the services proposed, define strategies to increase community involvement, and identify residents to participate in ongoing implementation of the COO initiative. Eleven community meetings were held in the target area reaching 270 community residents and representatives of city departments and community organizations.

**Key Findings:** Seven key areas emerged from the community feedback: 1) improve community safety; 2) increase community involvement; 3) provide employment; 4) enhance schools, services to youth, and support to parents; 5) stimulate economic development; 6) improve housing; and 7) support reliable CBOs and city services.

Far and away the greatest concern for residents in these areas was that they do not feel safe for themselves, their families, and their property. Community residents desire to be involved in improving conditions for themselves, their families, and the larger community. Adults and youth want access to employment in order for there to be significant changes in the conditions in these communities. These jobs need to be in a broad array of employment sectors and provide permanent work with sufficient pay to support a family. Schools, services, to youth, and support for parents must be enhanced to improve educational outcomes and strengthen families. There is a need for more retail outlets and other businesses including grocery stores, restaurants, and recreational facilities. There is also the need to close some of the liquor stores. Residents want to improve existing housing, primarily involving proper maintenance, rehabilitation and removal of hazards in public housing. They also desire increased access to safe and affordable housing opportunities without displacing residents. Many community members said they were not aware of the services that are provided by the city or local CBOs. They also indicated that the available services did not respond to their particular needs or they were not eligible for the available programs even though they needed it.
**Recommendations:** There is both an urgent need and an opportunity to continue to build the capacity of the community residents and institutions to be directly involved in determining and driving the changes that will be occurring in their neighborhoods. The report highlights specific recommendations for community involvement and engagement.

- Solidify a core group of at least 20 residents in each neighborhood who establish effective resident/neighborhood associations and implement community outreach strategies to engage a broad cross-section of diverse residents on an ongoing basis.
- Provide technical support and training services to resident associations and CBOs to (a) develop active resident associations which can partner with MOCD in implementing the COO initiative, (b) increase the effectiveness of service providers and (c) establish a functional service delivery network. Also form a network of technical support providers to assure ongoing capacity building services in the target communities.
- Build community relationships across the four nodes and across ethnic groups by co-designing a community building strategy for each area and by establishing a community building plan that connects residents from different backgrounds and throughout the Southeast sector.
- Facilitate ongoing community planning in each area so that residents can continue to describe a common vision, identify priorities, and establish regularly occurring forums to continue the dialogue with MOCD about the realization of the COO initiative.
- Mobilize and empower residents to voice their interests and advocate for policy changes and institutional accountability by assisting community members to identify key issues, providing advocacy training to community leaders, by supporting advocacy efforts, and by establishing forums for ongoing dialogues with city departments.
- Support ongoing community research by training residents about community assessments and assisting them to develop a community report card.
DEPARTMENT ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

A. Childrens Services Allocation Plan 2007-2010

Source: Department of Children, Youth and their Families (DCYF)

Release Date: December 2006

Overview: This report outlines DCYF funding priorities for fiscal years 2007 through 2010. DCYF funding represents 17.6% of city’s overall spending for children and youth and a third of local dollars spent on children. The report grows from a needs assessment conducted in 2005 and sets three primary goals: steward the Childrens Fund; convene stakeholders for policy solutions; and create responsive neighborhood based-networks. Seeking to maximize strategic leverage of city dollars, the allocation plan will: prioritize funding where there is greatest, best practices-based potential for impact; prioritize spending in areas where there is little or no other city spending; coordinate with other city departments and SFUSD; and expand the community accessibility of public facilities.

Key Findings: DCYF identifies seven service areas for funding allocations: early care and education, out of school time, youth workforce development, family support, wellness empowerment, violence response and truancy prevention, and youth empowerment. For 2007-08, expenditures will total $57,997,383. The largest areas of expenditure are out of school time ($15,695,000), early care and education ($11,828,650), and wellness empowerment ($10,015,000). Violence response and truancy prevention was the fifth priority with expenditures projected at $6,324,083. In addition, DCYF budgets $6,597,000 in system investments for 2007-08.

DCYF commits to serving all neighborhoods and all children while focusing on areas of greatest need. Using home zip codes of all clients, DCYF compiled a comprehensive overview of their provided services which cross-references zip code, index of need, percentage of San Francisco population ages 0-18, and percentage of total population served by DCYF programs. The highest-served zip codes are: Bay View/Hunters Point [14% DCYF programming], Inner Mission/Bernal Heights [14% DCYF programming], and Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside [15% DCYF programming]. DCYF uses this geographic overview to project where resources will be allocated in 2007-2010.

Recommendations: DCYF sets the following priorities as commitments for 2007-10.

- Serve all neighborhoods but focus on greatest need.
- Be increasingly sensitive to turf boundaries so that youth may safely receive services in their neighborhoods without crossing turf lines.
- Forge a responsive city-wide system; promote collaboration, inter-departmental accountability, and strategies for community networks.
- Increase community access to programs and services within allocation structure by expanding outreach, expanding hours, and expanding language-accessibility.
Empower communities by creating community-hubs and community-convening institutions where community residents can be involved in local growth.

B. I Tried to Stop Them; Children’s Exposure to Domestic Violence in San Francisco

Source: SafeStart, San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF); US Department of Justice; Association for the Study and Development of Community

Release Date: July 4, 2006

Overview: This report is based on the statistical premise that, nationally, children are disproportionately present in houses that are affected by domestic violence (DV). (Approximately half of reported incidents occur in households with at least one child under the age of 12, and children under the age of 5 are most likely to witness DV.) Further, research connects exposure to domestic violence with critical high-risk characteristics: emotional and behavioral disturbance, low self-esteem, social isolation, and aggression against peers, family, and property.

Key Findings: SFPD data indicates that DV occurs disproportionately in communities of color. (While the African American community comprises 8% of SF’s population, it accounts for 35% of DV incidents. While the Latino community accounts for 14% of SF’s population, it accounts for 21% of DV incidents.) Further, SFPD tracks DV incidents by police district; districts with the highest rate of reported DV incidents, however, do not correspond to those districts with the highest rate of recorded incidents of child exposure to DV. The proportion of police responses to DV incidents with child presence documented is highest in Bayview (40%), Ingleside (38%) and Taraval (34%), and is lowest in Central (11%) and Tenderloin (14%). Though it is extremely difficult to calculate total numbers, SafeStart SF approximates that between 11,500 and 16,500 children are exposed to DV in SF annually.

SFPD estimates that 30% of DV incidents are currently reported, that 32% of those are formally investigated, that arrests are issued in 80% of formally investigated cases, and that 44% of arrests are pursued by the District Attorney. In sum, fewer than 5% of DV incidents in SF result in felony charges being filed.

Trend studies show SFPD response to reported DV incidents and the rate of arrest among formally investigated DV cases on the rise. However, the absolute number of formally investigated cases of DV is trending downward. The decline in formal investigation may have the effect of minimizing victim confidence in the system of enforcement and might therefore indirectly impact the likelihood of victims to report DV incidents. Finally, it seems that law enforcement engages with the most egregious cases of DV, but is less likely to intervene in cases of less extreme or pre-violent DV incidents.
**Recommendations:** Given these findings, SafeStart SF points to the need for a better coordinated, inter-departmental approach to DV prevention that re-examines the role of law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Such an approach should be a broad community effort which will:

- Explore methods to identify children exposed to domestic violence across several public and private systems and providers, including child welfare, family court, criminal court, law enforcement, and domestic violence systems.
- Prioritize the positive development of all children exposed to violence.
- Focus on rehabilitation of the victim *and* the batterer in domestic violence cases.
- Move away from over-reliance on law enforcement for early identification of at-risk families. Adopt a coordinated response to domestic violence that is preventative and long term.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

A. Intimate Partner Violence Strategic Plan 2003-2008

Source: Department of Public Health (DPH), Community Health Education Section (CHES)

Release Date: October, 2003

Overview: DPH CHES convened the Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) core group to explore qualitative and quantitative IPV data in San Francisco. The group explored root causes, risk factors, and prevention best practices through comprehensive data analysis, interviews, and community focus groups. Research highlighted key issue areas and target communities and subsequently identified critical strategies to address these.

CHES defines IPV as violence perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner (IP) which is part of a pattern of coercive and control-based behavior that can include many control-factors (i.e. threat of violence, psychological abuse, sexual assault, social isolation, deprivation, economic coercion) and that pertains to all adolescents and adults as perpetrators or victims regardless of gender, sexual orientation, class, religion, race, ability, or ethnicity. CHES differentiates between primary prevention (prevention before occurrence), secondary prevention (early detection), and tertiary prevention (minimization of IPV progression). Finally, CHES clearly defines a spectrum of prevention at six levels: 1) policy and legislation, 2) organizational practices, 3) coalitions and networks, 4) provider education, 5) community education, 6) individual knowledge and skill.

Having defined these terms, CHES identifies the following imperatives toward which the strategic plan is oriented: defining healthy relationships; developing community-based programs with primary prevention focus; educating children and youth; educating communities; limiting access to alcohol.

Key Findings: Data analysis used the San Francisco Violence Injury Reporting System (SFVIRJ), a 13 agency collaborative effort to understand patterns of violence in the city. To qualify the data collected and used, it is critical to acknowledge the limitation of quantitative IPV data. Research indicates that only 20% of rapes and 25% of physical assaults are reported to the police. Complex factors contribute to this lack of reporting, including power dynamics inherent in IPV, police mistrust, fear of deportation, fear of “outing,” economic dependence upon abusers, and others.

Acknowledging these limitations, CHES tracked IPV homicides between 1991 and 2001 as a statistical basis for prevention planning. Forty three IPV homicides occurred in San Francisco during this ten-year period. Of these victims, 15 victims were African-American, 15 Caucasian, 6 Latino, 6 Asian, and 1 identified as other. Seventeen homicides involved firearms, 14 involved knives, and 5 involved personal weapons. Eighty-six percent occurred in the home of the victim’s or victim and perpetrator’s shared residence.
CHES identifies oppression, poverty, mental health, and family dynamics as root causes of IPV. Alcohol, access to firearms, witnessing acts of violence, media, community deterioration, and incarceration are identified as risk factors. The causes and risk factors guide the prioritization of prevention objectives and strategies, as do the identification of four key issue areas/target populations. These four key areas are: pregnant women, the LGBT community, youth, and alcohol.

**Recommendations:** Recommendations were made as they relate to process and outcome objectives for IPV prevention. These include:

- Develop definitions of a healthy intimate partner relationship and a community promoting safe IP norms and develop a culturally appropriate marketing campaign to promote these models.
- Enhance DPH screening protocols to include primary prevention education, resources, and referrals in all city clinics and services.
- Prohibit sponsorship of community events by alcohol companies, reduce alcohol billboard and retail advertising, and promote ‘good neighbor’ policy to reduce alcohol sale.
- Advocate for elimination of media images that promote violence against women and girls.
- Incorporate a primary prevention framework and training curricula in all programs and contractual organizations. Support programs, community teams, coalitions and projects addressing primary IPV prevention.
- Train providers to incorporate culturally appropriate primary prevention into practices by identifying best practices and future partnerships among community agencies and faith-based groups.
- Use Community Action Model to identify community-based best practices, educate communities, build social support networks, and develop culturally appropriate curricula.

---

**B. Roadmap for Preventing Violence (Initial Report and Update)**

**Source:** San Francisco Violence Prevention Network with staff support from the SFDPH Community Health Education Division

**Release Date:** February 2001 (Initial Report); November 2004 (Update)

**Overview:** The San Francisco Violence Prevention Network (VPN), which is staffed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), was formed in 1995. The mission of the VPN is to facilitate collaboration and cooperation in San Francisco by using a systematic public health approach to prevent violence and promote peace. In October 1998, the VPN developed a framework for violence prevention that concentrated on three specific risk factors for violence: alcohol, firearms, and witnessing acts of violence.
Subsequently, in May 1999, the VPN embarked on a strategic planning initiative to develop preliminary goals and objectives for the three priority risk factors. This process included representatives from government, academic institutions, and community-based organizations (CBOs) involved in violence prevention and represented an important first step in developing a specific and targeted strategy for violence prevention in San Francisco.

A series of three focus groups - one for each of the priority risk factors – was held to further review and refine the preliminary goals and objectives. Finally in October 2000, a forum was held to obtain specific input that would guide the implementation of objectives; the identification of relevant follow-up activities, gaps in existing data, and necessary resources to develop a strategic plan for violence prevention in San Francisco. The goal of the forum was to develop preliminary recommendations to serve as guiding principles to assist neighborhood-based efforts to prevent violence within the context of a Citywide violence prevention strategy.

**Key Findings:** Three issue areas were covered in the initial document: alcohol, firearms, and witnessing acts of violence. A subsequent document was created in November 2004 to address community deterioration, media, and incarceration. Local data, to the degree it was available at the time, was provided for each of the 3 initial issue areas to identify where efforts might be best focused. Specific, measurable objectives were developed with accompanying strategies, some ideal for community groups, others best suited for a public agency, and others ideally implemented as a collaboration between public and private organizations. Evaluation measures and tools are suggested for each strategy. Healthy People 2010, the national health objectives established by the federal government served as the framework for the priority outcome objectives in both Roadmap documents.

**Recommendations:** Numerous specific strategies were developed to accomplish the goals and objectives of the six priority issue areas: 1) alcohol, 2) firearms, 3) witnessing acts of violence, 4) community deterioration, 5) media, and 6) incarceration). These strategies are summarized below.

- **Alcohol**
  - **Sale** – Implement good neighbor policy to hold liquor outlets responsible for crimes in their immediate proximity; make consistent the enforcement of alcohol sale and use city-wide.
  - **Data** – Develop data mapping system to demonstrate link between alcohol and violence; compile baseline data to demonstrate relationship between alcohol and domestic violence.
  - **Advertising** – Implement neighborhood-based anti-alcohol advertising campaigns; lower amount of alcohol advertising; increase alcohol-free community events.

- **Firearms**
  - **Ownership** – Conduct baseline survey of SF households with firearms; identify and confiscate guns from restraining order subjects.
  - **Training** – Incorporate firearm training into city-funded after-school activities and intake activities for juveniles entering the criminal justice system.
  - **Risk** – Develop risk assessment protocols for community-based service agencies; organize neighborhood-based community action teams to reduce firearm violence risk.
Witnessing acts of violence
- **Training** – Train service providers and city agency employees about risks associated with children’s exposure to violence and intimate partner violence
- **Media** – Develop comprehensive public media campaign on impact of violence
- **Identification** – Develop protocols for identifying children exposed to violence and children with post-traumatic stress disorder

Community deterioration
- **Housing** – Increase decent housing options; reduce sub-standard public housing units
- **Health and well-being** – Increase health-insured; increase access to non medical services; increase job training and high school completion rates.
- **Physical environment** – Beautify communities; increase support for parks and open spaces; decrease health-risk hazards.

Media
- **Violence** – Decrease hours youth are exposed to violence in media; increase alternative media outlets.

Incarceration
- **Alternatives** – Increase support for restorative justice strategies, rehabilitative alternatives, and youth development programs at juvenile hall.
- **Mental health** – Increase support for mental health court; increase mental health services for juveniles and former inmates; increase community-based jail diversion programs for adults with serious mental illnesses.
- **Race Equity** – Reduce disparity in number of indictments and length of prison terms due to racism, classism, and other forms of discrimination.

---

**C. Prevention Strategic Plan 2004-2008**

**Source:** Department of Public Health (DPH)

**Release Date:** February, 2004

**Overview:** DPH defines public health as being population-based (serving the entire population), prevention-focused, social-justice oriented, and systemic. To focus on strategic prevention planning, DPH convened a Prevention Planning Team and Prevention Workgroup comprised of representatives from 15 agencies and organizations. The workgroup’s objectives were to develop a multi-year plan, strengthen primary prevention, and address social and economic health determinants.

The planning group reviewed leading health problems in San Francisco, reviewed social determinants of health, and created a comprehensive causal web that represented connections between health outcomes (diseases/afflictions), clinical and physiological symptoms (health
indicators), individual behaviors (health-risk activities), and social, environmental, and political factors (social determinants). Having created this causal web, the workgroup identified focus health outcomes and social determinants with greatest impact in San Francisco. Workgroup recommendations strategically target social determinants and find key points of intervention to institutionalize prevention efforts.

Implementation of the plan is decentralized and long-term. Workgroup members take findings and recommendations to their respective agencies/organizations and execute them accordingly. Implementation is accompanied by ongoing evaluation, continual development of funding development strategy, and ongoing training to the public.

Key Findings: The planning workgroups considered the following critical health outcomes: depression, alcohol use disorder, heart disease, stroke, HIV/AIDS, dementia, lung cancer, asthma, osteoarthritis, drug overdose, and injury/disability. These health outcomes were then related to symptoms (i.e. hypertension, diabetes, cholesterol, obesity, and malnutrition) and individual behaviors (i.e. alcohol, violence, physical inactivity, injection drug use, and smoking). Finally, the health outcome, symptom and individual behavior categories were correlated to a list of social, environmental and political factors: low socio-economic status, institutional racism, social stress and violence, physical environment and transportation, and social support.

Given the causal connections and correlations identified in this comprehensive causal web, the workgroup identified four key health social determinants and two key health outcomes. The workgroup focused their recommendations strategically around these items, their analysis being that such focus would yield sustainable health improvements in San Francisco. The four social determinants identified were 1) low socio-economic status, 2) social isolation/connectedness, 3) institutional racism, and 4) transportation. The two health outcomes identified were cardiovascular disease and depression, as these are two leading causes of years of life lost (YLL) and disability adjusted life years (DALY) in San Francisco.

Looking strategically at the identified focus social determinants, key interventions were identified. They were: living wage, universal health care, affordable housing, access to quality/holistic health care services, regulation of targeted alcohol advertising, access to fruits and vegetables, access to quality child care, access to quality, multi-disciplinary education, and safe neighborhoods. Recommendations and strategies focused on these interventions.

Recommendations:
- Develop strategy for future investment in primary prevention services. (i.e. reinvest/redirect funding from services not achieving stated goals)
- Ensure that prevention is a core component of new program initiatives in a manner consistent with evidence-based intervention methods and selected social determinants.
- Advocate for policies that improve health status and decrease the impact of low socio-economic status (livable wages, employment development/full employment, results-based employment training, adequate supply of quality childcare, improved quality and quantity of housing, ensuring the social safety net, improved public transportation, increased public participation in political and social organizations, improved availability of respite services, and equal and fair education policies.)
Promote social connectedness and enhance relationships between communities and SFUSD, Department of Human Services, Recreation and Parks Department, Commission on Aging, etc.

Lessen effects of institutional racism by promoting analytic understanding of institutional racism and advocating for just policy.

Advocate for improved, safe accessible transportation serving all communities justly. Understand health impact of transportation services and develop impact guidelines accordingly.

**D. Mental Health Services Act CSS Plan**

*Source:* San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), Community Behavioral Health Services (CBHS)

*Release Date:* September 19, 2005

*Overview:* DPH and CBHS assembled the Behavioral Health Initiative Task Force (BHITF) in January 2005 to guide a comprehensive, community-based needs assessment and inform San Francisco’s mental health needs for the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) expenditure planning. Peer-to-peer family and consumer interviews, consumer lunches, position papers, special topic focus groups, service provider survey results, and best practice research informed BHITF’s process. This report highlights key issue areas identified through the needs assessment process.

*Key Findings:* Peer-to-peer interviews indicate the following issue areas:

- Mental health stigma, related to poor mental-health education and use of insensitive language.
- Lack of consumer information about diagnoses
- Lack of stable, affordable housing
- Need for vocational training, jobs, housing, and food services centralized at counseling locations
- Need for daytime services and support
- Need for improved relationship between law enforcement and mental health
- Mental health services that do not always allow families to stay together
- Persistence of underserved communities: African American, Samoan, Latino, Vietnamese, Chinese, Russian, Arab and Mayan
- Language barriers to service for monolingual communities: Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Russian, Arabic, and Tagalog
- Persistence of underserved, isolated communities: homeless, incarcerated, veteran, and disabled.
DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

A. Justice and Courage; A Blueprint for San Francisco’s Response to Domestic Violence

Source: Department on the Status of Women (DOSW)

Release Date: 2001

Overview: Following the murder of Claire Joyce Tempongko, who was stabbed to death by her estranged boyfriend in front of her two children in 2000, DOSW convened a review panel to set priorities for domestic violence response reform in San Francisco. The panel, comprised of community-based organizations and DOSW staff, aimed “to evaluate the Criminal Justice and Social Services’ response to domestic violence, identify gaps in services and barriers to people accessing available services, and make recommendations to remove those barriers and gaps.” The ensuing report makes recommendations in the following five areas: 1) oversight body, 2) interdepartmental communication and coordination, 3) resources, 4) protocols, and 5) data collection.

Key Findings: The Justice and Courage report is written ten years after the Charan Report (also written in response to the murder of a young woman by a former boyfriend/spouse), which was lauded as the nation’s first systemic domestic violence response investigation. The 1990 report made recommendations in areas closely paralleling those of the Justice and Courage report: interdepartmental coordination and communication, data and statistics, access to services, personnel training, and an interdisciplinary task force. In response to these recommendations, notable citywide changes were effected: new social service programs were established (i.e. Resolve to Stop the Violence Project), emphasis was placed on culturally and language-accessible services, and increased funding was allocated to existing service organizations. Furthermore, 1995 legislation passed mandating domestic violence death review teams, effectively establishing protocols for investigating domestic violence related cases and linking investigations with systemic response review. However bold these reforms, DOSW concludes that the Charan Report failed to identify an oversight body to manage reform implementation and coordination.

Much of the review panel’s analysis was based in and in-depth study of San Francisco’s response to Ms. Tempongko’s case over a two year period. The panel found that Ms. Tempongko contacted the police at least six times prior to her death for such incidents as hitting, attempted strangulation, restraining order violation, and threats of violence against her and her two children. She also filed for emergency protective orders and a Stay Away order, and sought help from the Victim/Witness Compensation Program. Mr. Ramirez, her abuser and alleged murderer, was sentenced to six months in jail between 1999 and 2000, during which time he participated in the Resolve to Stop the Violence Project. Mr. Ramirez was released on probation in March, 2001, and following his release Ms. Tempongko contacted police at least two more times, once for attempted strangulation. Mr. Ramirez was never prosecuted for either of these offenses.
In another facet of the review following Ms. Tempongko’s murder, DOSW held a press conference to solicit public testimony. Testimony identified needs in the following areas: coordination between existing criminal justice departments, review of policies and protocols, methods to ensure that policies and protocols are followed consistently, training on cultural awareness and victim sensitivity, and more serves for marginalized communities and children. Testimony emphasized that law enforcement agencies are inconsistent in the implementation of domestic violence protocols. Testimony also focused on systemic protocol that put women at risk, such as courts’ obligation that independent, formerly-battered women continue to deal with former partners regarding financial, legal, and familial matters.

**Recommendations:** Given this history and the context of public testimony, DOSW considers two commitments most critical for effective, systemic domestic violence response reform. The first of these is commitment to evaluation, accountability, and collaboration. The second is the development of a multi-disciplinary oversight committee. Under the umbrella of these two commitments, DOSW makes over one hundred inter-agency and agency-specific recommendations. Recommendations are made to the Department of Adult Probation, Department of Human Services, Child Protective Services, District Attorney’s Offices, Emergency Communication Department, Medical Examiner, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Superior Court- Criminal Division, San Francisco Superior Court- Family Division, and Community-Based Services. Because the recommendations made to each of these agencies are so comprehensive, this summary will focus on interagency recommendations which, as noted in the overview, fall into five areas: 1) oversight, 2) interdepartmental communication and coordination, 3) resources, 4) protocols, and 5) data collection.

- Create a multi-disciplinary oversight committee under the authority of the Commission and Department on the Status of Women with the responsibility to implement and evaluate impact of recommendations.
- Establish written protocols between SFPD, the District Attorney’s Office, Adult and Juvenile Probation Departments, the Sheriff’s Department and courts especially for the following areas: information sharing mechanism and timelines, outline of departmental roles, tracking system to document interdepartmental communication, guidelines to address new case prosecution and revocation of probation/parole, resolution of every domestic violence case.
- Establish an evaluation process to monitor implementation of individual agency and interdepartmental protocols.
- Develop compatible computer systems (such as JUSTIS) to track current and accurate data.
- Review training so that all personnel are trained in: victim sensitivity, cultural diversity, dynamics of domestic violence, connection between domestic violence and substance abuse, cross-training on the role of other services that victims/survivors encounter.
- Increase resources for community-based domestic violence agencies.
- Evaluate civil and criminal justice and social service systems’ accessibility to non-English speakers and/or readers.
B. Accountability Audit

Source: Department on the Status of Women (DOSW)

Release Date: January 19, 2006

Overview: DOSW published the Justice and Courage report in 2001 following the murder of Claire Tempongko. The report called for the creation of an interdisciplinary oversight body to implement and evaluate the report’s recommendations. The Safety and Accountability Audit represents the oversight and evaluation recommended by the 2001 report, and analyzes how practitioners are systematically organized to respond to domestic violence incidents. The audit looks not only at whether or not appropriate procedures and protocols are in place and followed, but also whether these policies and protocols have allowed practitioners to organize their thoughts, actions, and responses to domestic violence on a daily basis. Specifically, the audit will help policy makers decide how to embed

The audit was executed by a team comprised of representatives from criminal justice agencies and community based programs. The audit team looked at three levels of accountability: how practitioners are accountable to victims, how institutional workers are accountable to each other, and how criminal justice institutions hold abusive partners accountable to their victims. Using an audit methodology developed by Ellen Pence, PhD, of Praxis International, the team identified a central question to pose to San Francisco’s criminal justice system: “If we believe that certain factors make a particular victim more vulnerable how do we identify the presence of those factors and how then do we adapt our response?” The audit team focused this question at three stages of the criminal justice intervention system: 911 call through police patrol arrest decision, felony investigation through prosecutor rebooking, and motion to revoke process by probation or prosecution.

The team conducted personnel interviews and observations, and also conducted extensive text analysis to review the relevant policies and procedures of individual departments. Finally, the team created several focus groups to solicit targeted feedback: Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Asian Pacific Islander Women, LEP Latinas, mostly African-American women arrested for domestic violence who identify as victims of domestic violence, and representatives of the Public Defender’s Office.

Key Findings: The audit team identified five major gaps in the criminal justice system’s response to domestic violence.

1. “The system is not organized to help practitioners identify key factors of safety and danger in domestic violence cases on a consistent basis, and therefore information is not available for practitioners to assess dangerousness in cases throughout the criminal justice system.” San Francisco does not define risk factors systematically, and so opportunities to collect information about risk are missed at every identified intervention point.

2. “Interveners throughout the criminal justice system response do not adequately understand the crime of stalking, and therefore do not sufficiently investigate, document,
or respond to stalking cases.” Codes to identify stalking are lacking, and practitioners/interveners are not adequately trained on stalking.

3. “LEP speakers who are victims of battering face multiple barriers at each stage of intervention, including limited access to interpretation, translated materials, pertinent information about criminal justice system processes, and culturally competent workers.”

4. “Criminal justice efforts to hold batterers accountable to complying with court orders are lacking and therefore compromise victim safety.” Batterers are not being held accountable, and defendants often re-enroll in batterer intervention programs despite parole violations.

5. “Criminal justice system responses to domestic violence incidents do not account for the complexity of risk encountered by victims of battering from various social and cultural positions.”

Recommendations: Recommendations are extensive. The list below represents a synthesis of key recommendations organized by “gap.”

- **1a) Develop administrative practices to identify risk factors (patrol officers write supplemental reports and use vertical investigation to assess risk, Adult Probation includes risk/danger assessment tool in supplemental reports, written protocol includes SFPD and courts for issuance of Emergency Protection Orders.)**
- **1b) Expand domestic violence training requirements across departments (use DOSW Cross-Training Institute, expand allotted time for SFPD bi-annual patrol officer training, identify officers to serve as domestic violence experts for each police station, create domestic training DVD for District Attorney’s office, create permanent community-based training network between criminal justice agencies and community-based organizations.)**
- **1c) Enhance communication between criminal justice system agencies, between criminal justice system agencies and community based organizations, and between criminal justice system agencies and victims.**

- **2a) Expand Stalking Task Force through District Attorney’s stalking grant, provide expanded, mandatory stalking training, and provide treatment options for perpetrators and victims of stalking.**
- **2b) Develop protocol for identifying, documenting, and charging stalking cases.**

- **3a) Systematize pathway for recruiting and retaining interpreters and translators across all criminal justice systems.**
- **3b) Flag LEP victims in criminal justice database.**
- **3c) Work with community-based organizations to ensure culturally appropriate services and support, and establish written protocol for working with LEP victims.**

- **4a) Create a San Francisco Domestic Violence Court benchbook outlining courtroom procedures for domestic violence cases and recommend update of statewide benchbook.**
- **4b) Ensure that judges assigned to domestic violence court receive pertinent training, including training by National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.**
- **4c) Increase compliance of defendants for enrolling in and completing batterer intervention programs and develop domestic violence priority warrant system.**
- 4d) Develop more rigorous oversight of batterer intervention program through Adult Probation Department.

- 5a) Provide education and training for all practitioners on traditionally underserved/underrepresented communities generally and with specific reference to domestic violence, with special emphasis on the same-sex/ LGBT community.
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

A. AB636 Child Welfare Services System Improvement Plan

Source: San Francisco Department of Human Services, Children and Family Services (SFDHS CFS)

Release Date: September 2004

Overview: SFDHS convened a Strategic Improvement Plan (SIP) Core Team which met four times. The Core Team identified three focus outcome indicators with which to measure the successful improvement of the Department.

Key Findings: Three outcome indicators were identified in the plan.

1. Reduce rate of occurrence of abuse in homes where children are not removed. Baseline in San Francisco for this statistic was, in 2004, 11.5% as compared to 9.6% statewide. SIP aims to reduce this rate of occurrence from 11.5% to 8.6%.

2. Reduce percentage of foster youth who reenter within 12 months of reunification. Baseline in San Francisco for this statistic was, in 2004, 24.8% as compared with 13.4% statewide. SIP aims to reduce this rate of reentry from 24.8% to 20.5%.

3. Ensure that every youth emancipates from San Francisco Foster Care Services with: sustainable housing; stable employment, income, or financial support; and enrolled in health care.

Recommendations: Under each outcome indicator, the core team identified sub-goals; the team further developed implementation strategies for each sub-goal with specific focus on the systemic change necessary, education and training necessary, and regulatory or statutory change necessary. Timelines for implementation are indicated by sub-goal. Sub-goals are summarized below.

- Standardize child welfare worker approach to assessment, placement decision making, and reunification.
- Consistently involve families, children, and other partners in case planning, reunification planning, and service delivery.
- Connect FCS-referred families to other public, private, or community services.
- Address and decrease reunification failures due to substance abuse or mental health relapse.
- Focus on 6 month family maintenance phase following reunification to stabilize youth and families.
- Develop accurate statistical profiles and thorough assessment of services to provide for youth recently emancipated and approaching emancipation.
- Increase percentage of youth who graduate from high school and who emancipate with documented connections to continuing education and/or vocational training.
DEPARTMENT OF AGING AND ADULT SERVICES

A. Community Needs Assessment 2006

Source: the Department of Aging and Adult Services, San Francisco Human Services Agency Planning Unit

Release Date: September, 2006

Overview: The Older Americans Act (OAA) and Older Californians Act (OCA) require the Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) to conduct a citywide needs assessment every four years. This report is the fulfillment of that requirement whose purpose is “to estimate the unmet needs for services for seniors and adults with disabilities, taking into consideration services currently provided by the DAAS and its contractors, other city departments, and other community-based providers.” The needs assessment was conducted by the San Francisco Human Services Agency Planning Unit (SFHSAPU). The findings are comprehensive, so this summary focuses on the need areas pertaining to violence prevention: isolation, abuse, caregiver support, and service/information access.

Key Findings: Isolation is a critical risk factor for the safety of elderly populations in San Francisco. 40% of homes in San Francisco with a resident over the age of 60 are single resident homes, meaning that elder lives alone. This rate compares with 33% statewide. Beyond residential isolation, seniors are isolated by language; 28% of San Francisco speakers are limited English proficient (LEP), and over 26,000 are termed ‘linguistically isolated.’ Discrimination isolates seniors, particularly those in traditionally marginalized communities like the LGBT community. Finally, seniors are isolated by lack of access to transportation; seniors in the Bay View neighborhood, for example, cite the lack of transportation to and from grocery stores, and there is a city-wide gap in available par transit to transport elders to and from needed social services.

Seven types of elder abuse are generally recognized: physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, financial exploitation, neglect, abandonment, and self-neglect. Most reported incidents of elder abuse are self-neglect, where isolated seniors fail to care for themselves adequately. Reporting for elder abuse is typically low; a high-profile case documented in the San Francisco Chronicle in 2005, however, dramatically increased rates of reporting. In fiscal year 2005-06, Adult Protective Services (APS) received 3,714 reports of adult abuse, 72% of which involved abuse against elders.

Many seniors receive primary aid from unpaid family members. Research indicates that these caretakers need financial, emotional, and social support. DHS could not accurately determine the number of unpaid, independent caretakers in San Francisco, but projects that there are between 15,453 and 46,192 in the city. OAA funded organizations provide support services to only 700 independent caretakers in San Francisco, and it is therefore evident that there is a substantial gap in caretaker supports.
Several communities of elders are identified as communities of particular need. The LGBT elder community is traditionally isolated, perhaps in response to discrimination and lack of culturally competent services. LEP communities, often immigrant communities, are isolated by difficult access to language-relevant services. Elders in public housing units are at particular risk for two reasons. First, many are low-income, living in public housing, and self-isolated because they are fearful of environmental dangers. Second, there is a significant gap in services for these seniors; in the 23 public housing units in the city which house some 2,200 seniors, there are currently 2 social workers. Finally, younger adults with disabilities are a particularly at-risk group, largely because of the fragmentation of services that exist to meet their particular needs.

**Recommendations:**

- Expand utilization of day programs for seniors.
- Ensure that mainstream services are culturally competent and relevant, with particular attention to the LGBT senior community.
- Increase capacity of APS staff to handle increase in elder abuse reporting.
- Decrease fragmentation of services. Of particular importance, combine behavioral health and primary health services in DPH so that seniors may receive behavioral treatment for dementia and centralize services for adults with disabilities.
- Reorganize services for seniors in a way that seeks creative strategies to engage them, such as peer-to-peer mentoring. Providers cannot assume that seniors want and will seek services.
- Increase availability of services for caregivers and increase access to information for caregivers.
- Increase seniors’ knowledge of telephone hotlines and other means of accessing information.
- Enhance respite care.
- Continue to work to decrease language barriers to services.
- Increase access to public transit for seniors, especially par transit and public transit that facilitates day-to-day functioning (access to services, grocery store, etc.)
MAYOR’S OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

A. Workforce Development Strategic Plan

Source: Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development (MOEWD)

Release Date: February 2006

Overview: MOEWD’s strategic plan proposes a three-phased process. Phase one conducts aggregate, workforce, and small business analyses to describe economic and workforce context in San Francisco. Phase two identifies priority areas and target industries. Phase three develops specific systems, strategies and initiatives for coordinated growth. The plan identifies key stakeholders, target industries, and structural support for workforce development.

Key Findings: The Plan identifies key stakeholder responsibilities. These stakeholders include: the MOEWD Workforce Development Department (policy agenda, inter-departmental coordination, quality oversight); The Workforce Investment Board (identify emerging public and private sector opportunities, oversee WIA funds, develop priority goals); the Business Community (hiring and work base requirements); Community Colleges (curriculum development and training); Labor (recruitment, case-management, and retention services); and Community Based Organizations (job quality assessment, training, and placement). Together, these stakeholders seek to: meet the needs of job seekers, workers, and businesses by providing access to training and advancement, especially for low-income, lower-skilled workers and seekers; coordinate support services; develop a pipeline of skilled and prepared workers; meet the short and long-term staffing needs of local employers; and grow San Francisco business.

Recommendations: The plan issues recommendations for coordinated, inter-departmental restructuring to create a more efficient and effective workforce development system.

- Focus on key industry sectors to leverage both public and private resources and meet objectives of job seekers, workers, and businesses. Key sectors are: biotechnology, healthcare, hospitality, information technology and digital media, retail, and transportation and logistics.
- Implement Worker Service Delivery Model, an Employment Opportunity Ladder in which support services (mental health services, records expungement, etc.) are the foundation for pre-training (GED and soft skills), job training (City Build and other programs), job placement (appropriate job match support), retention (support services), and advancement (further training).
- Increase communication and coordination between stakeholders.
- Establish common performance and capacity requirements.
- Develop common outcome measures and definitions (like a centralized database), and seek additional funding.
MAYOR’S OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

A. SF Safe City

Source: Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice (MOCJ)

Release Date: November, 2006

Overview: Following issuance of SF Safe Summer 2006 (a coordinated initiative amongst City departments, law enforcement, the courts, and the community to combat high violence rates), MOCJ summarized San Francisco’s current and ongoing practices in crime management. Specifically, practices are organized by five categories: 1) collaboration amongst public safety agencies, 2) prevention, 3) intervention, 4) enhanced criminal justice effectiveness, and 5) community policing. The report gives a comprehensive overview of programs, initiatives, and community based organizations in each of these five areas. Because the report is a summary and not a plan, recommendations are not included.

Key Findings: Without listing all programs, summary findings indicate critical initiatives and programs. These include:

- **Criminal Justice Working Group** – Working group increased SFPD staffing and capacity and advanced juvenile curfew.
- **Daily Violent Incident Analysis Calls** – Key Department heads speak daily to discuss instances of violence in the city that day. Conversations allow for strategic response to crime patterns as well as identification of target offenders.
- **Mayor’s Youth Employment and Education Program, Workreation, CityBuild, Onestop Center, and Community-based job training** – Provide job and vocational training for youth and probation youth to expand gainful employment opportunities and divert violent crime.
- **Community Response Network** – Focuses on neighborhood services, street outreach, and crisis response to prevent and suppress gang violence. Developed in the Mission District three years prior to this report, the Community Response Network combines emergency community response with inter-departmental services streamlining.
- **Weed and Seed Grant** – Funds neighborhood-based strategies which encourage residents to work closely with law enforcement to reduce crime and increase social service access. Grant is shared between Visitacion Valley Community Beacon Center and SFPD Ingleside Station.
- **Operation Ceasefire** – Modeled after nationally-replicated Boston model, Operation Ceasefire focuses on gun and gang violence in San Francisco by targeted intensive intervention with well-known suspected perpetrators, more rapid gun violence response, and targeted prosecution of gun trafficking.
- **JUSTIS and COMPSTAT** – Technology-driven criminal justice initiatives use centralized data system to heighten law enforcement efficacy.
INTER-AGENCY REPORTS

A. Juvenile Justice Local Action Plan; 2006 Update

Source: Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice (MOCJ), Juvenile Probation Department (JPD)

Release Date: April, 2006

Overview: The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) exists to “develop a comprehensive, multi-agency plan that identifies the resources and strategies for providing an effective continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of male and female juvenile offenders.” This plan proposes funding priorities for fiscal year 2006-07 through three funding streams; Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JCCPA), Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG), and Juvenile Probation Camps Fund (JPCF).

Key Findings: State JJCC appropriations ($2,187,092 in FY05-06) are typically announced and disseminated in October prior to the fiscal year of their use. For FY 06-07, the Governor proposed cutting JJCC appropriations by 75% but has since proposed continuing funding at a normal level. However, appropriations will not be announced until the state budget is signed, which will likely happen between July and September of the fiscal year. JJCC thus makes funding priority recommendations without knowledge of its precise appropriation.

JJCC revises the 2003 Local Action Plan Circle of Care and identifies 13 “areas” of the juvenile justice system, defining target population and purpose for each. These “areas” represent the spectrum of juvenile justice and probation in San Francisco and set context for JJCC funding recommendations. Circle of Care stages are: prevention; 1) Prevention 2) early risk identification and intervention; 3) pre-adjudication community-based intervention; 4) pre-adjudication community-based supervision and intervention (alternative to detention); 5) post-adjudication supervision and intervention; 6) intensive post-adjudication supervision and intervention (alternative to detention); 7) pre and post adjudication emergency shelter program; 8) county detention; 9) short term residential program; 10) intensive highly-structured long term residential program; 11) county residential facility; 12) state incarceration; 13) and aftercare.

JJCC planning and Community Focus Group input establish critical gaps in Circle of Care Juvenile Justice programs. These issues include: need for more family involvement at all levels of service; need for collaboration between Probation and CBOs (cross-training for partnership, increased Probation referrals to CBOs, more collaboration and fewer duplications across system); need for training, technical assistance, and capacity expansion for CBOs; necessity of mutual, measurable accountability for both Probation and CBOs; need to explore greater range of alternatives to incarceration; need for shelter programs for specific needs groups (undocumented youth, young women, youth with mental health issues, youth in transition from out-of-home placement, youth aged out of system, non-English speaking youth); need for job training; and
need for youth empowerment through system (youth-led projects, restorative justice opportunities, youth on board of directors of CBOs).

**Recommendations:** Based on findings and uncertain funding streams, JJCC sets priority for programs that deal exclusively with or primarily serve youth in Juvenile Justice System. JJCC recommends that other funding streams be explored for programs that serve at-risk youth not in the juvenile justice system. (Alternative funding streams include: DCYF, DHS, DPH, SF Public Library, SFUSD, SFPD, DPR, YO! Programs, museums and theaters.) Within the parameters of these priorities, and seeking to address needs established above, JJCC makes the following funding recommendations for FY 06-07:

- **New JJCPA programs:**
  - Evening Reporting Centers; alternative to detention
  - Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Programs; focus on competency-development and skill-building
  - JJCPA Utilization Review Manager; ongoing accountability management for probation and CBOs
  - Mandatory JJCPA evaluation; formerly funded by state, now San Francisco responsibility

- **Continued JJCPA programs:**
  - Community Assessment and Referral Center; alternative to detention
  - Girls’ Services; gender-specific social services
  - Life Long Learning Academy; extended-day charter high school for at-risk and juvenile justice involved youth
  - Principal Center (Youth Treatment and Education Center and Impact High School merger); substance abuse day treatment program and community school
  - Serious Offender Supervision Program; random visitation to determine probation compliance

- **Continued JABG programs:**
  - Public Defender Juvenile Assistance Project; PD information and access to education, placement, and community services

- **Discontinued programs**
  - Safe Havens (do not directly serve juvenile justice youth)
  - Beacon Case Management Programs (do not directly serve juvenile justice youth)
  - Intensive Home-Based Supervision Enhancement (emphasis is too heavily on supervision without adequate focus on competency-development and skill-building)
B. Gang Free Communities Assessment Plan

Source: Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice (MOCJ), Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF), San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department

Release Date: November 2002

Overview: This comprehensive report, the culmination of a year-long planning process, examines gang activity in San Francisco through four interrelated analytic areas: gang crimes, gang offenders, gang members, and gangs. The data-driven planning process involved over 500 individuals and agencies. Major findings in each of the four aforementioned areas are tied to organizational, programmatic, and strategic recommendations.

Key Findings:

Gang crimes: Key patterns to gang crime exist and can inform both prevention and intervention strategies. Gang crimes are highly concentrated; 89% of census blocks have no suspected violent gang crime whereas 1% of census blocks account for 36% of suspected violent gang crime. Public housing developments have only a weak causal effect on elevated gang crime with the exception of four public housing developments: one in Bay View, two in Potrero Hill, and one in Visatcion Valley. Gang crimes tend to peak between the hours of 4 pm and 7 pm, with smaller spikes at 12 noon and midnight.

Gang offenders: Gang offenders do not necessarily live in the same neighborhoods where gang activity is highest. Only four neighborhoods are targeted as having high levels of gang crime and residential concentration of offenders: Bayview, Mission, Western Addition, and Downtown/Tenderloin. Secondly, large numbers of gang offenders are minor offenders who could be rehabilitated if identified early. Long-term incarceration, however, may have the effect of perpetuating criminal activity in these minor offenders. Patterns of offense exist by gender and race/ethnicity, and may help inform early intervention strategy.

Gang members: Even in neighborhoods most effected by concentrated gang activity, only a minority of youth actually join a gang. Those that do tend to join before the age of 15, and in African American gangs many youth join before they are 11. Many at-risk behaviors are identified, perhaps the most significant of which is exposure to violence. Most gang members also exhibit critical resiliency factors as well: most are in school and many passing, one third are employed and the vast majority would like to be employed, and most are connected to at least one social institution. Intervention can capitalize on these resilience factors. Furthermore, gang members interviewed state overwhelmingly that they join for friendship, money, and protection (with clear patterns among these motivations existing by race/ethnicity). Finally, most youth state that they would leave a gang when they “aged out,” but also cited family as a critical reason to leave a gang.

Gangs: There exist critically important patterns of gang crime, leadership hierarchy, entry/exit patterns, and territorialism by race/ethnicity. Understanding of these patterns by group can improve the efficacy of intervention strategy.
Recommendations:

- Representatives from four housing developments associated with high levels of gang activity (BVHP, Potrero Hill, and Visitacion Valley) should be involved in prevention planning.
- Comprehensive prevention and suppression programs should focus on four neighborhoods with high levels of gang crime and concentrations of offenders: Bayview, Mission, Western Addition, and Downtown/Tenderloin. Other neighborhoods, where gang offenders live but may not be active, should be targeted for prevention programs.
- Focus on early rehabilitation for minor-offender gang members can prevent violent offenses later in life.
- Middle school is a critical time for preventative intervention of at-risk youth, since most youth join gangs between the ages of 12 and 14.
- Intervention strategy should enable community institutions to compete with gangs for the ability to provide youth with friendship networks, protection, and money.
- City should address key barriers to improving the gang problem: institutional rivalries, lack of information-sharing, failure to develop a coordinated approach by San Francisco’s public agencies, geographic and programmatic rivalries among community-based organizations, and failure of parents to recognize and address the risk of gang involvement in their children.
- Coordination should address the lack of systematic information sharing and collaboration between the Juvenile Probation Department and the Police Department.
- Ride-alongs, probation attention to gang hangouts, and other focused strategies could prevent newly returned youth from becoming involved in more serious crimes.
- Probation strategies need to occur in the community and must be available over evenings and weekends.

C. San Francisco Community Policing: A Report on Current Efforts

Source: San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), San Francisco Mayor’s Office

Release Date: November, 2006

Overview: SFPD defines community policing as a “cooperative partnership between police officers and members of the communities they serve” which, “rather than incident driven, is proactive and results oriented. It provides a strategy for police to buttress a community’s ability to produce and maintain attractive and safe neighborhoods on an ongoing basis.” This report on current efforts provides a departmental overview outlining SFPD’s infrastructural commitment to community policing. This overview is followed by descriptions of activity/program areas at each of the ten district police stations.

Key Findings: The Chief of Police appoints the Director of Community Policing who serves as liaison between the department, community organizations, and other city agencies. The Director
oversees 40 community policing officers (who work over 40 beat patrol geographical areas in San Francisco’s 10 policing districts) and 30 full-time school resource officers; works closely with Community Boards’ alternative dispute resolution programs; and partners with community programs such as SAFE, Inc., Community Partnership for Safer Neighborhoods, and Community Courts. Community policing priorities are set by police district, as dictated by ongoing documentation of community-identified need as well as monthly police community relations meetings at each station.

SFPD Training Division continues to actively recruit and train new officers. In addition to Basic Recruit Academy, Field Training Program, and Continuing Training Program, Community Police Officers are trained in the SARA (Scan, Analyze, Response, Assessment) method. Officers are also trained in methodologies such as conflict mediation, de-escalation, relationship-building and communication, creative problem solving and cultural competency.

While SFPD actively recruits a diverse police body, reaching out to many communities in San Francisco, there is nonetheless remarkable consistency in the demographic makeup of SFPD applicants. Between August of 2001 and August of 2006, for example, an average of 31.8% of applicants were white males, 16.4% were Latino males, 15.8% were Asian males, and 9.5% were Black males. Moreover, 81.6% of applicants were male, although 54% were either minority or women. What is most notable about these numbers is that, while they represent the average of eight recruitment cycles, the representation by race and gender in any given cycle almost never varied by more than 3-4% total from the previous cycle.

Recommendations: To enhance community trust, SFPD names the following initiatives:

- Revitalize SFPD citizen patrols
- Create an SFPD Professional Standard Unit
- Enhance citizen input and feedback through ongoing SFPD survey process
- Prove near real-time public safety information on SFPD Crime MAPS website
- Enhance and expand community policing segments of the SFPD website.