

File No. 160337 Committee Item No. 3  
Board Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Date October 13, 2016

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Cmte Board

- |                                     |                          |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence                        |

**OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)**

- |                                     |                          |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Referral FYI - 04/12/2016</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>2014 Comprehensive Report</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____                            |

Completed by: Erica Major Date October 7, 2016  
Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# **5<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco 2014**



## **Family Violence Council** Addressing Violence throughout the Lifespan

City and County of San Francisco  
Department on the Status of Women

Compiled by Allison Ipsen & Minouche Kandel  
September 2015



Emily M. Murase, PhD  
Executive Director



Edwin M. Lee  
Mayor

## Acknowledgements

---

Special thanks to the Family Violence Council Tri-Chairs:

- Katie Albright, Director, Child Abuse Council at the San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Center;
- Beverly Upton, Executive Director, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium; and
- Shawna Reeves, Director, Elder Abuse Prevention at the Institute on Aging.

The 2014 Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco would not have been possible without the tremendous effort of Department on the Status of Women policy fellow Allison Ipsen, who collected data from all sectors of San Francisco, compiled and edited the report. Council Tri-Chairs provided important feedback, Women's Policy Director Minouche Kandel supervised the production of this report, and Policy Intern Katherine Veatch helped with editing.

The Family Violence Council is staffed by the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, under the supervision of Dr. Emily M. Murase, Executive Director.

© 2015, San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

Compiled by Allison Ipsen, Public Policy Fellow &  
Minouche Kandel, Esq., Women's Policy Director

The San Francisco Family Violence Council is administered by the Department on the Status of Women.

Visit <http://sfgov.org/dosw/family-violence-council> for more information about the Family Violence Council and to download a copy of this report.

## Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Introduction</b> .....	6
<b>About the Council</b> .....	6
<b>About the Report</b> .....	7
<b>Work of the Council – Major Achievements in 2014</b> .....	8
<b>San Francisco Family Violence Council Members Fiscal Year 2014</b> .....	9
<b>Family Violence-Related Deaths</b> .....	10
<b>Criminal Justice Agencies &amp; Civil Courts</b> .....	12
Department of Emergency Management .....	13
Police Department: Special Victims Unit .....	18
Office of the District Attorney .....	25
Adult Probation Department.....	34
Juvenile Probation Department.....	37
Sheriff’s Department .....	39
Public Defender’s Office .....	42
Superior Court .....	44
<b>Public Service Agencies</b> .....	47
Department on the Status of Women.....	48
Family & Children’s Services.....	50
CalWORKs Domestic Violence Advocates .....	59
Adult Protective Services .....	61
Department of Public Health .....	66
Department of Child Support Services .....	73
San Francisco Unified School District .....	75
<b>Community-Based Agencies</b> .....	77
Child Abuse Prevention & Support Services .....	78
Domestic Violence Prevention & Support Services .....	81
Elder Abuse Prevention & Support Services .....	86
<b>Limitations of the Data</b> .....	89
<b>Statistical Summary</b> .....	90
<b>Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b> .....	92
<b>Family Violence Council Recommendations for 2016</b> .....	93
<b>Appendix A: Status of Implementation of Recommendations from 2012/13</b> .....	94

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The 5<sup>th</sup> *Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco* covers data from government agencies and community service providers from July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014 (fiscal year 2014).<sup>1</sup> The report demonstrates the continued prevalence of family violence in San Francisco. The following summarizes the detailed data in this report.

## **Domestic Violence**

- No change in 911 call volume.
- 23% decline in domestic violence cases investigated by the San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit (SVU).
- 39% decrease in domestic violence cases filed by the District Attorney's office.
- 14% increase in clients assisted by Victim Services.
- 30% increase in persons with domestic violence charges completing probation; 15% increase in revocations of probation.
- 27% increase in persons referred from Domestic Violence Court to Sheriff's Department Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP).
- 14% decline in CalWORKs families that received domestic violence services.
- 53% increase in individuals served by community based agencies offering transitional and permanent housing to domestic violence survivors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year terminology is represented differently in this report: in the past it was FY2013-FY2014; now, simply FY2014.

**Findings: Domestic Violence**

	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Department of Emergency Management: 911 Calls <sup>2</sup>	8,437	0
San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit: Cases Received & Assessed	3,383	-16
SFPD SVU: Cases Investigated	2,041	-23
SFPD SVU: Percent Investigated	60%	-6%
District Attorney: Cases Filed	279	-40
District Attorney: Conviction Rate <sup>3</sup>	90%	+8%
District Attorney Victim Services: Clients Assisted <sup>4</sup>	1,306	+14
Adult Probation Department: Completions	125	+30
Adult Probation Department: Probation Revocations	72	+15
Juvenile Probation Department: Domestic Violence Petitions Filed	20 <sup>5</sup>	-17 <sup>6</sup>
Sheriff's Department: Resolve to Stop the Violence Project - Participants with Domestic Violence Charges	40	+27
Family Court: Requests for Domestic Violence Restraining Orders	1,220	+3
CaIWORKS: Average Monthly Caseload of Domestic Violence Advocates	143	-14
Department of Public Health: Trauma Recovery Center Clients	715	-4
Child Support Services: Cases with Family Violence	1,536	-2
Community Based Agencies: Domestic Violence Crisis Line Calls	23,796	-3
Community Based Agencies: Domestic Violence Emergency Shelter Individuals Served	540	+7
Community Based Agencies: Domestic Violence Transitional Housing Individuals Served	364	+53

<sup>2</sup> Includes 911 calls for domestic violence and stalking.

<sup>3</sup> Conviction rate is for entire Domestic Violence Unit, which prosecutes domestic violence, stalking, and elder/dependent adult abuse cases.

<sup>4</sup> Includes children witnessing domestic violence.

<sup>5</sup> Total petitions for calendar year 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Percent change from calendar year 2013.

## Child Abuse

- 18% decline in referrals to Family and Children's Services (FCS); 28% increase in referrals substantiated as abuse by FCS.
- 92% decline in child abuse cases received and assessed by the San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit; 15% increase in child abuse cases investigated by SVU.
- SVU investigation of child abuse cases has declined overall by 51% since FY2011.
- FCS substantiated four times the number of child abuse cases than SVU investigated.
- 19% increase in child abuse cases filed by the District Attorney's Office Child Assault Unit.
- 19% increase in Adult Probation Department's specified child abuse caseload; 37% increase in enrollment of Child Abuse Intervention Program, which is facilitated by the Department of Public Health (clients referred from Adult Probation).

### Findings: Child Abuse

	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Department of Emergency Management: 911 Calls	32	-3
San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit: Cases Received & Assessed	401	-92
SFPD SVU: Cases Investigated	240	+15
SFPD SVU: Percent Investigated	67%	+63%
District Attorney: Cases Received	142	-30
District Attorney: Cases Filed	69	+19
District Attorney: Conviction Rate <sup>7</sup>	26%	-20%
District Attorney Victim Services: Clients Assisted <sup>8</sup>	289	+7
Adult Probation Department: Child Abuse Unit	37	+19
Family & Children's Services: Children Referred	4,524 <sup>9</sup>	-18 <sup>10</sup>
Family & Children's Services: Referrals Substantiated as Abuse	921	+28
Department of Public Health: Child Abuse Intervention Prevention Program - Clients Enrolled	19	+37
San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Center: TALK Line Calls Received	16,015	+2

<sup>7</sup> Of cases brought to trial.

<sup>8</sup> Includes minor victims of human trafficking for the first time.

<sup>9</sup> Total referrals for calendar year 2014.

<sup>10</sup> Percent change from calendar year 2013.

## Elder & Dependent Adult Abuse

- Adult Protective Services received 7% fewer referrals, yet confirmed 16% more cases as unique cases of abuse by others.
- 32% increase in elder physical abuse cases received and assessed and 39% increase in physical abuse cases investigated by the Special Victims Unit; 34% increase in elder financial abuse cases received and assessed by SVU; 26 elder financial abuse cases were investigated; the elder financial abuse investigation rate declined 16 percentage points.
- Over the past four fiscal years, elder abuse cases investigated by SVU has declined 58%.
- Adult Protective Services confirmed 962 unique cases of abuse by others, 11 times the number of elder abuse cases SVU investigated.
- The Office of the District Attorney filed 35% fewer elder abuse cases.
- 21% increase in clients assisted by Victim Services.
- 32% fewer requests for elder abuse restraining orders.

<i>Findings: Elder &amp; Dependent Adult Abuse</i>	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Department of Emergency Management: 911 Calls	133	+2
San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit: Physical Abuse Cases Received & Assessed	95	+32
SFPD SVU: Physical Abuse Cases Investigated	61	+39
SFPD SVU: Physical Abuse Cases Percent Investigated	64%	+7%
SFPD SVU: Financial Abuse Cases Received & Assessed	94	+34
SFPD SVU: Financial Abuse Cases Investigated	26	-4
SFPD SVU: Financial Abuse Cases Percent Investigated	28%	-16%
District Attorney: Cases Filed	39	-35
District Attorney: Conviction Rate <sup>11</sup>	90%	+8%
District Attorney Victim Services: Clients Assisted	258	+21
Probate & Civil Harassment Courts: Requests for Elder Abuse Restraining Orders	54	-32
Adult Protective Services: Cases Received	6,207	-4
Adult Protective Services: Unique Confirmed Cases of Abuse by Others	962	+16
Elder Abuse Forensic Center New Cases	45	+20

<sup>11</sup> Conviction rate is for entire Domestic Violence Unit, which prosecutes domestic violence, stalking, and elder/dependent adult abuse cases.



## Recommendations for 2016

Family Violence Council member agencies committed to objectives related to family violence to implement starting in 2016. These objectives are detailed in the Recommendations section of this report and summarized below.

1. Standardize a data collection protocol with agencies so that they are able to provide the same type of data each year.
2. Focus on language access issues across the board.
3. Develop further training in best practices in responding to family violence for all agencies.
4. Develop an improved protocol with the Police Department and Adult Protective Services on investigating elder abuse cases.
5. Add three inspectors to the Police Department Special Victims Unit, and assign an investigator specifically to elder financial abuse cases.
6. Review the Police Department Special Victims Unit annually, to assess best practices for investigation of child abuse, elder abuse and domestic violence.

# INTRODUCTION

---

The Family Violence Council is pleased to provide the *5<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco*, covering fiscal year 2014. Since the report was first released in June 2009, it has expanded to include data from an increasing number of City departments, providing a more nuanced picture of the current status of family violence in San Francisco, and the agencies and services in place to respond to this complex issue. Domestic violence, child abuse, and elder or dependent adult abuse are all forms of family violence and describe abuse that may be physical, sexual, psychological, or economic. Family violence has serious and traumatizing effects on individuals, families, and entire communities. It is defined as a pattern of behavior in any relationship that is used to isolate, neglect, or exercise power and control over an intimate partner, child, elder, or dependent adult.

## **About the Council**

The San Francisco Family Violence Council (Council) was established by local ordinance to increase awareness and understanding of family violence and its consequences; and to recommend programs, policies, and coordination of City services in order to reduce the incidence of family violence in San Francisco. In 2007, San Francisco became the first county to broaden the scope of its Attorney General-mandated Domestic Violence Council to include child abuse and elder abuse along with domestic violence. The Family Violence Council is tri-chaired by three community-based experts in these different forms of family violence and has become a key body in coordinating enhanced communication and collaborative efforts among its many partners. The Council recommends and helps implement family violence-related policy changes to the City and issues this report annually. The report remains the only document that provides a broad view of the statistics and trends related to the full spectrum of family violence in San Francisco.

In April 2015, the Family Violence Council Ordinance was updated to include six new City agencies, fulfilling a recommendation of the 2012/13 report. The Public Defender's Office, Juvenile Probation Department, Unified School District, Department of Human Resources, Animal Care and Control, and Fire Department are new official members of the Family Violence Council. (Several of these agencies have already been participating in the Family Violence Council, but were not previously official members.) The introduction of new members increases the Council's potential to collaborate across systems and improves the capacity and quality of our reporting on the status of family violence.

## **About the Report**

This report fulfills one of the Council's priorities - the tracking and analyzing of family violence data. The report provides a snapshot of where and how survivors of violence seek help and how perpetrators of violence are held accountable and monitored. Trends identified in the report serve as an important tool for policy-makers, agencies serving survivors and perpetrators of family violence, and community advocates throughout San Francisco. This report summarizes data from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 (FY2014), and includes information from 12 City public agencies and 26 community-based organizations. The data in this report includes:

- Family violence-related deaths;
- Calls to 911;
- Cases received and investigated by the San Francisco Police Department- Special Victims Unit;
- Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, and Elder Abuse cases at the District Attorney's Office;
- Victims of family violence who received advocacy and support from the District Attorney's Victim Services Division;
- Caseloads of the Adult Probation Department's Domestic Violence Unit;
- Domestic violence offender statistics from the Juvenile Probation Department;
- Caseloads of the violence prevention programs at the Sheriff's Department;
- Domestic Violence Restraining Order requests and dispositions from Family Court;
- Elder Abuse Restraining Order requests and dispositions from Probate Court;
- Child abuse allegation and substantiation data from Family and Children's Services;
- Elder and dependent adult abuse and neglect data from Adult Protective Services;
- Data on survivors of violence in programs of the Department of Public Health;
- Family Violence caseloads from the Department of Child Support Services;
- CalWORKs Domestic Violence advocate caseloads;
- Child abuse reports and programs on healthy relationships at San Francisco Unified School District;
- Domestic Violence community-based support services;
- Child Abuse community-based support services; and
- Elder Abuse community-based support services.

San Francisco recognizes the importance of providing a broad range of access points for survivors of abuse. Our network of public agencies and non-profit providers are all key parts of a system intended to protect and support those who seek help, and to hold accountable those who perpetrate family violence. By understanding how and where residents access family violence-related services, and how service providers meet the needs of survivors and hold perpetrators of abuse accountable, the City is better able to create impactful policies, fund appropriate programs, and keep San Francisco residents safe in their homes.

**It is important to note that this report does not provide an unduplicated count of victims of family violence as there is currently no method for tracking an individual from program to program or service to service.** For example, it is possible that a survivor of elder abuse could be counted in the Adult Protective Services data, as well as in the 911 call data, and the Probate Court Restraining Order data. Therefore, the possibility of the duplicated count of some, or even many, individuals is likely. There can be some measure of linear analysis when examining the criminal justice statistics, as most cases follow a standard path from a 911 emergency call, to a Police Department report, to a case referred to the District Attorney's Office. However, the complexities of family violence and the many variables involved in these cases make even this well-defined route prone to twists and turns. Though the report is structured in this order for ease of reading, straight progressions cannot and should not be assumed.

San Francisco's prioritization of responding to family violence manifests in the active involvement of so many City departments and non-profits in the work of the Family Violence Council. This year's report includes 6 recommendations for the upcoming year, informed by the data from FY2014. Through education, collaboration, advocacy, and systems change, the Council aspires to eliminate family violence and make San Francisco a safer place for residents of all ages.

### **Work of the Council – Major Achievements in 2014**

- The Housing Authority, in response to a suggestion from the Housing Committee of the Justice and Courage Oversight Panel, which has now transitioned into the work of the Family Violence Council, acquired two new domestic violence advocates who have offices on-site;
- The *5<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco* expanded data collection to include the Juvenile Probation Department.
- The Department of Child Support Services staff received training on domestic violence, facilitated by the Department on the Status of Women.
- The Department of Public Health embarked on an initiative to train staff on Trauma Informed Care.
- Dr. Leigh Kimberg of the Department of Public Health presented to the Family Violence Council on Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and toxic stress, fulfilling a recommendation of the 2012/13 report.
- The Police Department implemented Limited English Proficiency (LEP) training for officers, including elder abuse and domestic violence scenarios. The training was developed with input from the community.
- The Police Department updated its Domestic Violence General Order and implemented a new Officer-Involved Domestic Violence policy, as well as a new Children of Arrested Parents Department General Order. These policy initiatives were also developed with input from the community.

## San Francisco Family Violence Council Members Fiscal Year 2014

Agency	Family Violence Council Representative
Adult Probation Department	<i>Chief Wendy Still, Tina Gilbert, Ramona Massey, Sunny Schwartz</i>
Batterer's Intervention Programs	<i>Dr. Antonio Ramirez</i>
Board of Supervisors	
Commission on the Status of Women/Department on the Status of Women	<i>Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Amy Ackerman, Dr. Emily Murase, Minouche Kandel</i>
Department of Aging and Adult Services	<i>Jill Nielsen</i>
Department of Animal Care & Control*	<i>Rebecca Katz, Denise BonGiovanni, Vicky Guldbach</i>
Department of Child Support Services	<i>Karen Roye, Freda Randolph Glenn</i>
Department of Children, Youth, & Their Families	<i>Jasmine Dawson, James Baird</i>
Department of Emergency Management	<i>Lisa Hoffman, Cecile Soto</i>
Department of Public Health	<i>Dr. Leigh Kimberg, Carol Schulte</i>
District Attorney's Office	<i>Elizabeth Aguilar Tarchi, Marianne Barrett, Maria Bee, Julius DeGuia, Marshall Khine, Sharon Woo</i>
Domestic Violence Consortium	<i>Beverly Upton</i>
Human Services Agency	<i>Sylvia Deporto</i>
Juvenile Probation Department*	<i>Chief Allen Nance, Fred Collier</i>
Mayor's Office	<i>Paul Henderson</i>
Police Department	<i>Capt. Jason Fox, Capt. Joseph McFadden, Lt. Trenia Wearing</i>
Public Defender's Office*	<i>Simin Shamji, Elizabeth Hilton</i>
San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Council	<i>Katie Albright, Kathy Baxter, Abigail Stewart Kahn</i>
San Francisco Elder Abuse Prevention Center	<i>Talitha Guinn, Shawna Reeves</i>
San Francisco Unified School District*	<i>Kevin Gogin, Laurie Vargas</i>
Sheriff's Department	<i>Delia Ginorio, Andrea Wright, Kathy Gorwood</i>
Superior Court	<i>Judge Susan Breall, Judge Kathleen Kelly</i>

*\*These agencies participated in the Council in FY2014, but did not become designated members until the Ordinance was updated in April 2015.*

Jerel McCrary, from Bay Area Legal Aid, serves as the Family Violence Council representative for the Sentencing Commission.

# FAMILY VIOLENCE-RELATED DEATHS

## Domestic Violence

Sadly, San Francisco's remarkable run of 44 months without a domestic violence homicide ended in January 2014. In calendar year 2014, there were five domestic violence related deaths, four homicides and one suicide, which appear to be related to domestic violence. Three of the homicides are still awaiting adjudication, but the defendant in these cases is a current or former intimate partner. In order to keep better track in "real" time of domestic violence related deaths in San Francisco, the Family Violence Council Report will start to follow these cases, recognizing that until there has been a final adjudication, they cannot definitively be considered domestic violence deaths. However, tracking in "real" time will enable early identification of trends

Additionally, the Council will facilitate a domestic violence death review team for these cases, starting in 2015. The team will investigate and review these domestic violence related deaths in order to make recommendations and implement improvements to prevent future abuse and death from similar circumstances. The team will examine the lives of the victims and perpetrators with particular focus on intersections between the individuals involved and the justice system, mental health system and/or social services system. Careful examination of the fatalities and the information collected will assist with public education, identifying risk factors, developing preventive measures and intervention strategies, and improving the coordination of efforts among agencies and service providers.

### 2014 Homicides in San Francisco

Gender	Homicide Victim
Female	4
Male	41
Total	45

*Three of the four homicides where there was a female victim were domestic violence related.*

### 2014 Domestic Violence Related Deaths in San Francisco

Gender	Homicide Victim	Homicide Defendant	Suicide
Female	3	1	0
Male	1	3	1
Transgender	0	0	0
Total	4	4	1

## Case Summaries

### 1. Homicide

On January 27, 2014, a 48 year-old homeless, Caucasian women was killed between the Mission and Potrero Hill neighborhoods. There was a physical altercation between the victim and the defendant, resulting in the victim hitting the sidewalk and dying from blunt force trauma. The defendant is a homeless, African American male, age 30 at the time of the homicide. The defendant had a preexisting restraining order for stalking another woman. The District Attorney charged the case on January 30, 2014.

### 2. Homicide

The perpetrator, a 30 year-old Asian female, stabbed the Caucasian, 40 year-old, male victim on July 18, 2014. The case was charged by the District Attorney on July 22, 2014.

### 3. Homicide

The victim, a 42 year-old Caucasian female, died of brain hemorrhage due to blunt force trauma on August 26, 2014. The perpetrator may have also employed strangulation. The defendant, a 48 year-old male, lived with the victim in Bernal Heights, where the homicide occurred. The case was charged by the District Attorney on August 29, 2014.

### 4. Homicide/Suicide

Early in the morning of October 14, 2014, a 35 year-old Asian (Chinese) female was shot and killed. The male perpetrator, age 29, proceeded to shoot and kill himself. The Police responded to a series of domestic disturbances at the residence the victim and perpetrator shared in the South of Market neighborhood the night before their deaths. The perpetrator had a prior arrest for domestic violence against the victim.

### *2014 California Data on Domestic Violence Homicide<sup>12</sup>*

- 8.9% of homicides in California where motive was known were domestic violence related;
- Of the women killed in California where motive was known, 34.1% were killed due to domestic violence.

## Elder Abuse Deaths

In fiscal year 2014, there were two homicides that appear to be related to elder abuse. One of the homicides has been charged and is waiting adjudication, while the other is still under investigation and has not yet been charged.

## Child Abuse Deaths

There were no known child abuse deaths in 2014.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Homicide in California*, Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General, California Department of Justice, <http://oag.ca.gov/crime> (2014).

# **Criminal Justice Agencies & Civil Courts**



# DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

---

## 911 Domestic Violence & Stalking Calls by Type FY2012-2014

Call Type	Description	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
418DV	Fight or Dispute – No Weapons Used	4,193	4,370	4,512
240DV	Assault/Battery (Includes Unwanted Physical Contact)	2,798	2,826	2,821
646	Stalking	522	436	376
650DV	Threats (Written, Verbal, or Recorded)	298	272	280
594DV	Malicious Mischief/Vandalism (Property Damage Only)	93	106	93
602DV	Break-In	64	63	83
245DV	Aggravated Assault (Severe Injuries or Objects Used to Injure)	81	109	81
222DV	Armed Assailant – Knife	62	70	52
416DV	Civil Standby (Officer Takes a Person to Retrieve Belongings)	45	41	51
646DV	Domestic Violence Stalking	13	58	36
419DV	Fight or Dispute – Weapons Used	22	25	20
219DV	Stabbing	23	10	13
221DV	Armed Assailant – Gun	14	19	13
910DV	Well-Being Check (Often at the Request of Another Individual)	13	10	5
100DV	Alarm (Given to a Victim to Alert 911)	0	0	1
Total Domestic Violence & Stalking Calls		8,241	8,415	8,437

*911 Child Abuse Calls by Type  
FY2012-2014*

Call Type	Description	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
240CA	Assault/Battery (Includes Unwanted Physical Contact)	17	29	22
910CA	Well-Being Check	6	4	10
245CA	Aggravated Assault (Severe Injuries or Objects Used to Injure)	3	0	0
	Total Child Abuse Calls <sup>13</sup>	26	33	32


*911 Elder Abuse Calls by Type  
FY2012-2014*

Call Type	Description	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
368EA	Elder Abuse	48	55	61
240EA	Assault/Battery (Includes Unwanted Physical Contact)	21	36	27
470EA	Fraud	11	17	17
910EA	Well-Being Check	7	10	16
650EA	Threats	2	4	6
488EA	Petty Theft	3	4	3
418EA	Fight or Dispute – No Weapons Used	6	4	3
212EA	Strong-Arm Robbery	1	0	0
245EA	Aggravated Assault (Severe Injuries or Objects Used to Injure)	1	0	0
	Elder Abuse Calls Total	100	130	133

<sup>13</sup> Family and Children's Services' hotline is the primary intake for child abuse emergency calls.

**911 Elder Abuse Calls  
Call Type Prevalance  
FY2014**

- Elder Abuse
- Assault/Battery
- Fraud
- Well-Being Check
- Other Call Types



**Family Violence Overview**


**911 Family Violence Calls  
FY2012-2014**

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Domestic Violence & Stalking	8,241	8,415	8,437	0
Child Abuse	26	33	32	-3
Elder Abuse	100	130	133	+2
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,367</b>	<b>8,142</b>	<b>8,602</b>	<b>+5</b>

**Family Violence Percentage of 911 Violent Crime Calls  
FY2014**

Family Violence Calls	8,602
All Violent Crime Calls <sup>14</sup>	100,428
<b>Family Violence Percentage</b>	<b>9%</b>

<sup>14</sup> Includes the following codes: 211 (Robbery), 212 (Strong-arm Robbery), 213 (Purse Snatch), 219 (Stabbing), 221 (Armed Assailant – Gun), 222 (Armed Assailant – Knife), 240 (Assault/Battery), 245 (Aggravated Assault), 261 (Rape/Sexual Assault), 418 (Fight or Dispute – No Weapons Used), 419 (Fight or Dispute – Weapons Used), 487 (Grand Theft), 488 (Petty Theft), 594 (Malicious Mischief/Vandalism), 602 (Break-In), 646 (Stalking), 650 (Threats)



**1 in 11 violent crime calls to 911 are family violence related**

### Family Violence Calls by Neighborhood Police Stations

Prevalence of calls across the districts has followed the same trend for the past three fiscal years.

*District Unit Responses to 911 Family Violence Calls  
FY2012-2014*


District	FY2012 <sup>15</sup>	FY2013	FY2014
Bayview	1,314	1,191	1,311
Ingleside	1,173	1,277	1,187
Southern	996	1,046	1,068
Northern	1,011	1,040	1,055
Mission	1,048	1,098	1,027
Taraval	747	824	797
Central	648	619	583
Tenderloin	551	589	627
Park	422	430	521
Richmond	401	401	369
Daly City <sup>16</sup>	26	20	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,337</b>	<b>8,535</b>	<b>8,569<sup>17</sup></b>

<sup>15</sup> Statistics for FY2011-2013 include Family Violence codes (DV, CA, EA) and Stalking (646).

<sup>16</sup> Dispatchers may refer a call to Daly City if an incident occurs on or over the City's southern boundary, or if a suspect is known to have traveled into Daly City.

<sup>17</sup> Computer Aided Dispatch entries (911 calls) never match one for one with dispatched sector cars, because calls are cancelled, merged, or responded to beyond the county line such as Daly City or South San Francisco, because the crime occurred in San Francisco, but the person does not live in our City or went to a hospital outside the county.

Map of District Unit Responses to 911 Family Violence Calls  
FY2014



# POLICE DEPARTMENT: SPECIAL VICTIMS UNIT


---

The San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit (SVU) reviews and investigates felony family violence cases. The Department of Emergency Management may receive multiple calls to 911 for the same incident, or callers may call back to cancel a request for assistance. The Special Victims Unit received and assessed a total of 3,979 family violence cases in fiscal year 2014. Over the course of FY2014, the Special Victims Unit had two different Captains. Additionally, the Unit had a staff of 55 individuals including: 3 Lieutenants, 42 investigators, 5 officers, 2 police service aides, and 2 interns.<sup>18</sup> In 2011, the Police Department was entirely restructured after having experienced staffing shortages due to mass retirements. Police Chief Greg Suhr consolidated four sections of the Special Victims Unit scattered in offices throughout the city and combined them with human trafficking investigations, which were previously handled by the Vice Crimes Unit. The 300 person shortage across the Police Department that began in 2011 has influenced SVU's state of flux in regard to staffing and case intake over the past three fiscal years.

The Special Victims Unit includes the Domestic Violence Section, Child Abuse Section, Sex Crimes Section, and Elder Abuse and Financial Crimes Section, which includes elder and dependent adult physical and financial abuse cases, as well as all fraud-related crimes in the City and County of San Francisco. There is a Lieutenant for each Section that is responsible for overseeing the investigation of its cases. Under this structure, all inspectors and officers working in the Special Victims Unit are cross-trained in the special skills and techniques necessary for investigating all types of cases that fall under the purview of the Unit. Thus, individual inspectors and officers may not be exclusively assigned to domestic violence, child abuse, elder abuse and dependent adult abuse, or fraud-related cases.

## Domestic Violence

In FY2014, there was a 16% decrease in the number of domestic violence cases that the Police Department received and assessed (3,383). There was not a corresponding decline in domestic violence 911 calls, so this small downward trend cannot necessarily be attributed to an actual decline in domestic violence. Of cases received, 317 or 60% were investigated. This is a 23% decrease in cases investigated since fiscal year 2013, and 35% fewer cases investigated since fiscal year 2012. The 23% decrease in cases investigated points to the need for more staff resources in the Special Victims Unit.




---

<sup>18</sup> Represents the average, which is close to the actual personnel numbers; interns are not considered full time staff members and their participation can be considered to equal 1 full time staff person.

**Domestic Violence Statistics  
FY2011-2014**

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received & Assessed <sup>19</sup>	3,922	4,560	4,031	3,383	-16
Misdemeanor Arrests Referred to DA's Office	529	444	348	317	-9
Cases Investigated <sup>20</sup>	1,538	3,129	2,655	2,041	-23
Percent Investigated	45%	69%	66%	60%	-6%

**Domestic Violence Cross-Agency Comparison  
FY2011-2014**



<sup>19</sup> Includes all domestic violence cases that are referred to the Special Victims Unit.

<sup>20</sup> Represents cases that make it to the investigatory stage.

### **Achievement**

*In October 2014, the Police Department introduced a new Member Involved Domestic Violence Policy and updated its Domestic Violence General Order. The new Member Involved Domestic Violence Policy creates a clear reporting protocol if an officer is involved in domestic violence in San Francisco or another county. The reporting protocol outlines that access to weapons, Department issued electronic devices, and Department databases must be addressed in officer involved cases. The new policy also prohibits the Police Department from hiring anyone with a prior conviction for a domestic violence related offense. This policy was spearheaded by the San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium. The updated General Order now requires the provision of language appropriate information for limited English proficient domestic violence victims. It also gives specific guidance for when to refer to Family and Children's Services when children are present in domestic violence situations. This aspect of the General Order will be evaluated with a review in 2015.*

### **Child Abuse**

In FY2014, the Unit received and assessed 401 cases, 92% fewer than in FY2013. These numbers highlight inconsistencies in how cases are coded and tracked. The substantial increase in cases in FY2012 (2,959 cases) and FY2013 (5,078 cases) was attributed by SVU to the new Crime Data Warehouse (CDW) online records and management system that the Police Department began using in 2011. CDW allowed for better tracking of incident reporting city-wide, better coding of incidents and routing to appropriate units for follow up, and significantly more accurate record keeping. The increase was also attributed to legal protocols around mandated reporting that increased the number and kind of referrals SFPD gets from city government and community-based agencies. Family and Children's Services cross reports all cases to SVU. Most of these do not meet the criminal definitions of child abuse. In FY2013, of the 5,078 child abuse cases received, only four percent met SVU's criteria for investigation.

During fiscal year 2014, the Unit saw various changes in leadership and staffing, which can influence the criteria for what constitutes a case. A plausible explanation for the significant decrease in the caseload is that the Police Department did not include in this year's data the referrals from Family and Children's Services that did not meet the criminal definition of child abuse. The fluctuation in data points to the need to create a standardized data collection protocol for all family violence members.




**Recommendation**

Standardize a data collection protocol with agencies so that they are able to provide the same type of data each year.

**Child Abuse Statistics  
FY2011-2014**

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received & Assessed	545	2,959	5,078	401	-92
Cases Investigated	492	130	204	240	+15
Percent Investigated	90%	4%	4%	67%	+63%

**Child Abuse Cross-Agency Comparison  
FY2011-2014**




## Elder Abuse

The Elder Abuse and Financial Crimes Section oversees elder and dependent adult physical and financial abuse cases, as well as all fraud-related crimes. In FY2014, the Section received and assessed a total of 189 elder and dependent adult physical and financial abuse cases. Of these cases, 87 were investigated. In comparison, San Francisco Adult Protective Services (APS) received 6,207 cases and confirmed 2,190 of these cases. Adult Protective Services cross reports all cases of vulnerable adult/elder abuse that involve “abuse by others,” excluding cases that involve self-neglect only, to SVU. The large disparity between APS and SFPD cases indicate the need for better cross-referral policies.

### **Recommendation**


*Develop an improved protocol with the Police Department and Adult Protective Services on investigating elder abuse cases.*

**Elder Abuse Cross-Agency Comparison  
FY2011-2014**



### Elder Physical Abuse

The Elder Abuse and Financial Crimes Section received and assessed 95 elder and dependent adult physical abuse cases, marking a 32% caseload increase. The Section investigated 61 cases, 64% of all cases received. For comparison, APS confirmed 201 cases of physical abuse in FY2014.




#### Elder Physical Abuse Statistics FY2011-2014

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received & Assessed	67	57	65	95	+32
Cases Investigated	39	30	37	61	+39
Percent Investigated	58%	53%	57%	64%	+7%

### Elder Financial Abuse

The Elder Abuse and Financial Crimes Section received and assessed 94 elder and dependent adult financial abuse cases in FY2014, increasing its caseload by 33%. However, this increase must be viewed in the greater context of a dramatic decrease in the caseload between FY2011 and FY2012 from 445 cases to only 70 cases. From FY2011 to FY2014, the caseload declined 79%. The declining caseload suggests the need for more staff resources to investigate elder financial abuse cases.



The percentage of cases investigated dropped from 44% in FY2013 to 28% in FY2014. Only 26 elder financial abuse cases were investigated, which may not adequately represent the impact of this issue on the community considering APS confirmed 357 cases of elder and dependent adult financial abuse in FY2014. Substantial changes in the number of elder financial abuse cases received and the investigation rate for these cases over the past four fiscal years could be attributed to individual leadership decisions within SVU on how to handle APS referrals and what constitutes a case, as well as to the mass shortage of SFPD staff beginning in 2011.

In fiscal year 2014, there were no specialized inspectors for elder financial abuse cases.


**Recommendation**

Add three inspectors to the Special Victims Unit, and assign an investigator specifically to elder financial abuse cases.

**Elder Financial Abuse Statistics  
FY2011-2014**

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received & Assessed	445	70	62	94	+34
Cases Investigated	167	36	27	26	-4
Percent Investigated	38%	51%	44%	28%	-16%

**Elder Financial Abuse Statistics  
FY2011-2014**



# OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

---

The District Attorney's Office (DA) oversees the prosecution of family violence crimes and has three units to oversee those cases: the Child Assault Unit, the Domestic Violence Unit, and the Special Prosecutions Unit, which handles elder financial abuse cases. The general stages of cases received and accepted by the DA are outlined in the appendix.

The data included in the following charts refers to the specific fiscal year. Cases pled or brought to trial during a specified fiscal year may or may not have been filed during that same time period. Similarly, trial convictions may be achieved for cases filed or trials initiated during a prior year. For example, a case may be received and filed in FY2013, but that case may not be concluded, either through plea bargain, trial, or dismissal, until a subsequent year.

Starting in July 2013, the DA has implemented a major expansion of its case management system, significantly improving the quality of family violence data maintained by the office. Previously, data for this report was collected using paper based systems. Pre-2013 data are therefore less reliable and comparisons across time periods may not be accurate. The DA's office is committed to continuing to refine and enhance their collection of family violence data. Fiscal year 2014 was a period of significant transition for the expansion project, which included shifting to automated data collection and changing the nature of some of the data available for this report from years past.


## **Domestic Violence Unit**

The District Attorney's Domestic Violence Unit prosecutes felony and misdemeanor domestic violence, stalking, and elder or dependent adult physical abuse cases. The Domestic Violence Unit started managing elder and dependent adult physical abuse cases in FY2014. The Special Prosecutions Unit prosecutes elder or dependent adult financial abuse cases. Due to the expansion of the District Attorney's case management system, the office intends to start reporting on these financial abuse cases in FY2015.

In FY2014 the District Attorney's Office commissioned Gerald W. Fineman, Supervising Deputy District Attorney for the County of Riverside, to review the practices and procedures being utilized in the San Francisco District Attorney's Office in handling domestic violence cases. He found no deficiency in the office's filing based on the cases it received. He stated that the District Attorney's Office "does an excellent job in utilizing all options to hold batterers accountable, including post-release community supervision violations, probation violations, parole, etc."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Letter: *Training and Review of San Francisco District Attorney's Office Domestic Violence Unit*, Gerald W. Fineman, Supervising Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, County of Riverside (October 11, 2013).



During FY2014, the Domestic Violence Unit continued its downward trend in cases received and filed. There were 16% fewer cases received (1,536) and 39% fewer cases filed (327). Out of the 327 cases filed, 123 were referred for probation or parole violation, 266 led to convictions by guilty plea, 45 were brought to trial, and 27 cases brought to trial resulted in convictions (60%). Compared to FY2013, the Domestic Violence Unit total conviction rate, including convictions by guilty plea, increased by eight percent.



Following the overall downward trend, filing decreased for all case types in the Domestic Violence Unit – domestic violence cases decreased by 40%; stalking by 75%; and elder/adult dependent physical abuse by 35%. The decline in cases received reflects criminal activity and police practices. However, in regard to the lower filing rate, the District Attorney’s Office has made a concerted effort to ensure that only cases that can be proven beyond a reasonable doubt are charged. The Domestic Violence Unit has streamlined its filing criteria, and enhanced its charging processes to ensure sound charging, which is reflected in the slightly higher conviction rate. Anecdotally, numbers from the first half of FY14-15 are continuing to show this upward trend in conviction rate.

*Domestic Violence Unit: Case Statistics<sup>22</sup>*  
*FY2012-2014*

	FY2012 <sup>23</sup>	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received	1,955	1,827	1,536	-16
Filed	565	538	327	-39
Referred for Probation/Parole Violation <sup>24</sup>	NA	141 <sup>25</sup>	123	NA <sup>26</sup>
Convictions by Guilty Plea <sup>27</sup>	505	415	266	-36
Cases Brought to Trial	42	49	45	-8
Convictions After Trial	22	25	27	+7
Conviction Rate (Cases Brought to Trial)	52%	51%	60%	+9%
<b>Total Convictions</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>-33</b>
<b>Total Conviction Rate (All Cases Filed)</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>+8%</b>

*Domestic Violence Unit: Cases Filed by Crime Type*  
*FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Domestic Violence	458	442	279	-40
Stalking	38	36	9	-75
Elder Abuse	69	60	39	-35
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>-39</b>

<sup>22</sup> The total for convictions by guilty plea and cases brought to trial does not add up to the number of cases filed in FY2013-2014 because convictions pled and cases brought to trial during a specified fiscal year may have been filed in a previous fiscal year.

<sup>23</sup> Numbers have been combined for FY11-13 for domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuses cases. Up to FY2013-2014, elder abuse cases were handled by the Elder Abuse Unit.

<sup>24</sup> Cases referred for probation/parole violation are not a subset of "cases filed."

<sup>25</sup> Domestic violence and stalking cases only.

<sup>26</sup> Percent change from FY2012-2013 is not applicable for convictions by guilty cases referred for probation/parole violation because numbers before FY2013-2014 in this category only account for domestic violence and stalking cases (does not include elder abuse cases).

<sup>27</sup> Conviction by guilty plea includes convictions obtained by plea or parole violation.

## Child Assault Unit

The District Attorney's Child Assault Unit prosecutes felony cases of physical or sexual assault against children, child endangerment, human trafficking of children, and cases involving child pornography. In conjunction with San Francisco General Hospital, Family and Children's Services, and the Police Department, the Child Assault Unit participates in multi-disciplinary interviews, conducted by the Child and Adolescent Support and Advocacy Resource Center (CASARC). These multi-disciplinary interviews provide a coordinated forensic investigation and response to children abused or children exposed to violence in San Francisco.



During FY2014, the Child Assault Unit received fewer cases overall (30% decrease) but filed more (19% increase) – close to 50% of cases received were filed; only 27% of cases were filed in FY2013. Out of the 69 cases filed in FY2014, eight were referred for probation or as a parole violation, 16 led to convictions by guilty plea, and two were brought to trial. Both cases brought to trial resulted in convictions. Though 19% more cases were filed, 36% fewer cases resulted in convictions by guilty plea, contributing to the 31% decline in convictions overall and low 26% total conviction rate. The majority of cases were referred for physical assault (67%), followed by sexual assault (30%), and human trafficking (3%).

### Child Assault Unit: Case Statistics FY2012-2014

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received	171	204	142	-30
Filed	61	56	69	+19
Referred for Probation/Parole Violation	NA	NA	8	-
Convictions by Guilty Plea	23	25	16	-36
Cases Brought to Trial	3	1	2	+50
Convictions After Trial	1	1	2	+50
Total Convictions	24	26	18	-31
Conviction Rate (Cases Brought to Trial)	33%	100%	100%	0
Total Convictions	24	26	18	-31
Total Conviction Rate (All Cases Filed)	39%	46%	26%	-20%



*Child Assault Unit: Cases by Crime Type  
FY2014*

	Physical Assault	Sexual Assault	Human Trafficking
Cases Received	71	32	3
Filed	24	19	0
Cases Brought to Trial	0	2	0
Convictions After Trial	0	2	0

**Victim Services Division**

The District Attorney's Victim Services Division provides comprehensive advocacy and support to victims and witnesses of crime. Trained advocates help these individuals navigate the criminal justice system by assisting with crisis intervention, Victim Compensation Program claims, court escort, case status, transportation, resources, referrals, and more.

Child abuse clients include individuals who have experienced either physical abuse or sexual assault as a child. Domestic violence clients include individuals who have experienced domestic violence, including childhood exposure to domestic violence, or stalking. Elder abuse counts include cases of dependent adult abuse and financial crimes.


During FY2014, Victim Services provided support and services to victims and witnesses in 1,853 family violence cases with 70% of clients seen for domestic violence or child witnessing domestic violence, 16% for child abuse, and 14% for elder abuse. The overall caseload increased by 13%.

*Victim Services Division: Family Violence Statistics  
FY2011-2014*


	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Domestic Violence	1,137	990	1,136	+13
Child Witness DV	183	139	170	+18
Child Abuse	339	270	289 <sup>28</sup>	+7
Elder Abuse	248	205	258	+21
Total	1,907	1,604	1,853	+13

<sup>28</sup> Victim Services Child Abuse statistics does not include minor victims of human trafficking before FY2013-2014.

**Victim Services  
Family Violence Breakdown  
FY2013-2014**



**Victim Services Statistics  
FY2012-2014**



The following tables highlight demographic data of clients served in both FY2014. These data show that for this fiscal year, the majority of clients were female (76%) and represented the following races: Latina/o (27%), African American (27%), White (25%), and Asian (14%). Race statistics for the city and county overall as of 2013 show a different breakdown: 15% Latina/o, 6% African American, 54% White, and 34% Asian.<sup>29</sup> There were no significant changes in the prevalence of genders and races from fiscal years 2011-2013.

The Victim Services Division has challenges engaging the most vulnerable communities. The data shows that no identified transgender clients were served in fiscal year 2014. This is a data collection and engagement issue. Currently, there is not a process in place for clients to self-identify demographic information. Creating such a mechanism is a current goal of the Division. Additionally, the Division is studying barriers to reaching the LGBT community and potential solutions, as well as contracting with Community United Against Violence to provide violence prevention and engagement services to the LGBT community. A recent report by the SF LGBT Center assessing violence prevention needs for San Francisco's LGBTQI population found that transgender people are more likely than LGBQ cisgender people to have experienced physical violence multiple times in the past year (40% vs. 19%), before the age of 16 (48% vs. 37%), and by a family member (40% vs. 24%).<sup>30</sup> It also found that intimate partner violence affects transgender men disproportionately: 40% have experienced physical violence by their sexual/romantic partners. In comparison, the Trauma Recovery Center, an initiative of the Department of Public Health, saw 14 transgender survivors of violence, including physical assault, sexual assault, and domestic violence, in FY2014.

### Victim Services Family Violence Statistics: Gender FY2014

Gender	Domestic Violence	Child Witness DV	Child Abuse	Elder Abuse	Total	%Δ from FY2013
Female	977	83	210	146	1,416	+13
Male	158	87	79	111	435	+27
Transgender	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Unknown	1	0	0	1	2	NA
Total	1,136	170	289	258	1,853	+13


<sup>29</sup> *State and County QuickFacts*. U.S. Census Bureau, 22 Apr. 2015. Web. 12 May 2015.

<sup>30</sup> The SF LGBT Center. "San Francisco Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer & Intersex Violence Prevention Needs Assessment." (2015). *SF Center*. San Francisco Human Rights Commission, Jan. 2015. Web. 21 Apr. 2015.

**Victim Services Family Violence Statistics: Race  
FY2014**

Race	Domestic Violence	Child Witness DV	Child Abuse	Elder Abuse	Total	%Δ from FY2013
Latina/o	306	48	124	20	498	+5
African American	326	68	64	36	494	+14
White	324	11	54	75	464	+13
Asian	104	16	22	110	252	+5
Indian- South Asian	5	1	6	0	12	+58
Filipino	6	0	2	3	11	-31
Cambodian	5	0	0	1	6	+83
Other	8	7	4	4	23	+43
Unknown	52	19	13	9	93	+66
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,136</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>1,853</b>	<b>+13</b>

**San Francisco City & County Demographics**



The majority of Victim Services' child abuse cases in FY2014 were for sexual assault (63%), followed by physical abuse (36%). The Division served two minor clients for human trafficking. There were 143 child abuse clients age 0-17 and 135 age 18-64. Clients age 0-17 increased by 15%. The Victim Services Division has advocates out-stationed at the Child Advocacy Center center in the Bayview to attend Multi-Disciplinary Team Meetings for child sexual assault, abuse and human trafficking victims. Additionally, advocates can see other victims of crime who reside in the Southeast sector in order to facilitate easier access and coordination of other health and mental health resources.

*Victim Services Child Abuse Statistics: Age Range and Type of Abuse  
FY2014*

Age	Sexual Assault	Physical Abuse	Human Trafficking	Child Abuse Total	%Δ from FY2013
0-17	84	57	2	143	+15
18-64	91	44	0	135	+5
65+	0	0	0	0	NA
Unknown	8	3	0	11	-48
Total	183	104	2	289	+7

# ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT

---

## Domestic Violence


The San Francisco Adult Probation Department supervises individuals convicted of domestic violence as they complete the requirements of probation. At the end of Fiscal Year 2014, the Adult Probation Department Domestic Violence Unit was supervising 468 individuals. The total caseload has continued to decrease since FY2012.

At the end of FY2014, the Domestic Violence Unit had staff of ten including nine Deputy Probation Officers and one Domestic Violence Court officer, overseen by a Supervising Probation Officer. During the year, four Deputy Probation Officers assigned to non-specialized caseloads handled an average of 57 cases. The following specialized caseloads have been developed for supervision needs that are client specific:

- 18 – 25 Year Old: average of 61 cases per officer;
- Child Abuse: average of 32 cases per officer;
- Limited Supervision: average of 54 cases per officer; and
- Spanish Speaking: average of 70 cases per office.

When a person convicted of domestic violence is referred to Adult Probation Department for supervision, they are automatically referred to a 52-week Batterer's Intervention Program, run by a community agency and certified by Adult Probation Department. There were 10 certified Batterer's Intervention Programs in San Francisco as of the end of FY2014. The Department continued to utilize the Batterer's Intervention Program Audit Team. At the start of the FY2014 audit, there were 11 certified Batterer Intervention Programs in San Francisco. One program was decertified during the process, leaving ten certified batterer's intervention programs.

If a probationer fails to attend the Batterer's Intervention Program or commits a crime that violates their probation, a bench warrant is issued and Adult Probation Department begins a procedure to revoke probation. Revocations increased 15% and completions increased 30% in FY2014. More individuals are successfully completing counseling programs and the Domestic Violence Unit is holding more individuals accountable for probation violation.



*Domestic Violence Unit Statistics  
FY2011-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Total Cases at Year-End	540	522	468	-10
New Intakes	297	252	281	+11
Completions	79	88	125	+30
Revocations	58	61	72	+15
Certified Batterer's Intervention Programs Year-End	11	10	10	0
Domestic Violence Unit Staffing	10	10	10	0

**New Batterer's Intervention Program**

The Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC) opened its doors on June 18, 2013. The CASC, a partnership between the Adult Probation Department and Leaders in Community Alternatives, Inc., is an innovative one-stop reentry center that serves the comprehensive needs of clients under probation supervision. The CASC model aligns law enforcement and support services into an approach that is focused on accountability, responsibility, and opportunities for long-term change. It is designed to protect public safety, reduce victimization, maximize taxpayer dollars, and contribute to San Francisco's community vitality. The CASC was established in the City and County of San Francisco's Public Safety Realignment Plan in response to California Assembly Bill 109, passed in October, 2011, which transferred responsibility for all non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders to the county level, an effort to address the overreliance on state prisons. The CASC offers a Batterer's Intervention Program.

Additionally, a new Batter's Intervention Program was certified at the San Francisco Veterans Administration Medical Center called At Ease.

**Domestic Violence Unit Initiatives**


In September 2010, the Adult Probation Department received a federal grant to address the increasing number of domestic violence cases in the Bayview neighborhood, which was home to 14% of the Domestic Violence Unit probationers. The department used evidence-based practices to design a victim-centered supervision model and a 40:1 probationer to officer ratio. In FY2014, the Department applied for and received grant funding from the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services to continue this position. Thus, the Adult Probation Department is able to continue to facilitate the reduced caseload and successful victim-centered supervision approach.

The Department has developed and implemented gender responsive caseloads. The Domestic Violence Unit has one such caseload for female probationers. The Women's COMPAS assessment was launched on December 1, 2014. This assessment will assist the Department in becoming gender responsive to identify women's individual needs in creating case management plans that will result in successful rehabilitation. Information on the outcomes of the COMPAS assessment will be shared in future reports.

Additionally, the Department has continued work with an advisory team of domestic violence intervention and prevention experts to assist in the development and implementation of an Adult Probation Department Victim Service Program. The creation of this program was a recommendation of the 2011 and the 2012/13 Family Violence Reports. The advisory team representatives include the Survivor Restoration Director from the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, the Director of the Victim Services Division from the District Attorney's Office, the Director of the Domestic Violence Consortium, and the Division Director and Supervisor from the Adult Probation Department's Investigations Unit. The objective of the proposed Adult Probation Department Victim Service Program is to provide comprehensive gender specific, trauma informed services to victims of violent crimes perpetrated by those currently on probation within the Adult Probation Department. During FY2014, the advisory team worked on program budgetary planning. The advisory team plans to include survivors of violence in program planning.

### Child Abuse

The Domestic Violence Unit supervises an endangered child specific caseload. As of the end of FY2014, 37 clients were in supervision on the child abuse-specific caseload – seven more clients than at the end of FY2013. Of these cases, 64% are misdemeanor cases and 36% are felony cases. Individuals in the child abuse caseload are directed to the Child Abuse Intervention Program (CAIP), a 52-week program certified by the Adult Probation Department and run by the Department of Public Health at the Community Justice Center through the Violence Intervention Program.<sup>31</sup> The Domestic Violence Unit's child abuse-specific caseload and the Child Abuse Intervention Program were both launched in November 2012. The Department will provide more information on the success rate of clients in this new caseload and program in future reports.



<sup>31</sup> See the Department of Public Health's section of the report for data on the Child Abuse Intervention Program.



# JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT


## Domestic Violence Offenders

As a new member of the Family Violence Council, the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department is providing information on juvenile domestic violence offenders for the first time. The Juvenile Probation Department categorizes intimate partner violence as well as violence against parents committed by juveniles as domestic violence. In 2013, of domestic violence petitions filed, 58% were male offenders and 42% were female offenders. In 2014, 85% were male and only 15% were female.<sup>32</sup>

*Petitions for Domestic Violence Offenders: Gender Statistics  
CY2012-2014*

Gender	CY2012		CY2013		CY2014	
	Filed	Sustained	Filed	Sustained	Filed	Sustained
Male	16	6	14	6	17	7
Female	9	3	10	3	3	0
Total	25	9	24	9	20	7

*Percent Petitions Sustained  
CY2011-2014*



<sup>32</sup> Data are tracked by number of petitions, rather than individual probationers. One probationer could have multiple domestic violence petitions.

### **Juvenile Probation Cumulative Domestic Violence Statistics: 2010-2014**

- *Assault with deadly weapon other than a firearm was considerably the most prevalent petition reason (36% of petitions; all other reasons made up  $\leq 8\%$  individually).*
- *80% of petitions were charged as felonies; but only 25% of petitions sustained are felony offenses*
- *40% of petitions were suspended in favor of informal probation.*
- *39% (majority) of petitions filed and sustained were offenders age 17 (both genders)*
- *Petitions sustained: 75% male*
- *Petitions sustained: 44% Hispanic, 33% African American, 17% White*
- *Petitions filed and sustained: most prevalent neighborhoods: Ingleside/Excelsior, Bayview/Hunter's Point, Inner Mission*
- *Petitions are more likely to be sustained for older teens, males, and youth of color.*

# SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

---

The San Francisco Sheriff's Department oversees three innovative programs related to family violence that it currently operates through its Custody and Community Programs Divisions: the Resolve to Stop the Violence Project, an in-custody program; the Out of Custody Violence Prevention Program, and the Survivor Restoration Program for victims.

## **Resolve to Stop the Violence Project**

The Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP) is a survivor-centered program for in-custody offenders based on a restorative justice model. The mission of RSVP is to bring together all those harmed by crime, including victims, communities, and offenders. RSVP is driven by victim restoration, offender accountability, and community involvement. The goals of the program include empowering victims of violence, reducing recidivism among violent offenders, and restoring individuals and communities through community involvement and support in order to prevent future violence.

Expanding 29% in FY2014, RSVP served 195 participants. Of these participants, 24% were in custody for a family violence-related offense. Participants with domestic violence charges increased 27%. A recommendation of the 2012/13 Family Violence Council Report was to prioritize persons coming out of the Domestic Violence Court for the RSVP program. The increase in RSVP participants with domestic violence charges addresses this recommendation. It is the goal of the Sheriff's Department to reach half of participants with family violence-related offenses.

The 29% increase in RSVP participants is especially successful considering that San Francisco's jail population is declining. In calendar year 2013, the average daily jail population was 1,428, eight percent smaller than in CY2012 and 20% smaller than in CY2010.<sup>33</sup> Additionally, the Sheriff's Department reports that length of stay for individuals in the jail system as a whole is shorter than it has been in the past, which has increased turn-over of RSVP participants.



---

<sup>33</sup> San Francisco Office of the Controller. *Jail Population Study Update*. 28 May 2014. Web. 14 May 2015.

*RSVP: Participant Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2013	FY2014
Domestic Violence Charges	29	40
Elder Abuse Charges	1	2
Child Abuse Charges	1	5
On Parole	18	18
Percent Family Violence	22%	24%
Total Participants	139	195

**Out of Custody Community Program**

The Sheriff's Department utilizes the Manalive Violence Prevention Program curriculum both in the jails and at community-based sites. The out of custody program experienced an influx of 125 new clients in FY2014: 77% more clients than in FY2013. There was a 40% drop in clients referred from RSVP. The data reflect the fluidity of open enrollment: some people are terminated after one or more group sessions; others could graduate a day after the end of fiscal year, etc.

*Manalive: Client Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2013	FY2014
New Clients	29	125
Exiting Clients	150	153
Referred from RSVP Jail Program	23	14
Total Clients	186	188

**Survivor Restoration Project**

The Sheriff Department's Survivor Restoration Project (SRP) is a component of the RSVP that focuses on supporting survivors through their own process of restoration and empowerment, while providing opportunities for them to contribute to the development, implementation, and evaluation of all RSVP components. To this end, SRP offers direct services to the survivors of the violent offenders participating in RSVP's Offender Restoration component.

In FY2014, SRP graduated 51 clients from its Empowerment Program, a 14% increase from FY2013. Additionally, there was a 14% increase in U-Visas obtained by clients during the fiscal

year (65 clients). Overall the program saw fewer new clients and ongoing clients from previous years. There was a 30% decrease in new clients and a 33% decrease in ongoing clients.

In accordance with the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (VTVPA), the Sheriff's Department identifies qualified victims whether they are in custody or in a post release program and refers them to the SRP. In addition to referring clients to SRP, the Department's Criminal Investigation Unit has been authorized to complete the law enforcement certification step of the U-Visa process for immigrant survivors.

*Survivor Restoration Program: Client Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2013	FY2014
New Clients	276	193
Ongoing Clients <sup>34</sup>	1,579	1,083
Total U-Visas Obtained	56	65
Political Asylum Granted	4	6
Permanent Residence Granted	10	12
Graduated from Empowerment Program	44	51

**California State Victim Information and Notification Everyday System (VINE)**

In August 2013, as part of an effort to enhance its customer service information system, the Sheriff's Department inaugurated the California State Victim Information and Notification Everyday System (VINE). This allows victims of crimes in San Francisco to receive email or telephone notifications of offenders' custody status in California jails and prisons. This free and anonymous service allows victims to be notified within 30 minutes when an offender is released from custody and within eight hours if an inmate is transferred to another facility. Knowing this information can help alleviate a victim's uncertainty or concern about an offender's status. The Sheriff's Department has received positive feedback from Survivor Restoration clients that state that VINE has increased their sense of safety because providing them with more information empowers them to make different choices. Since the inception of VINE, 3,409 people have registered and used the service.

<sup>34</sup> These cases vary from a weekly phone call check to on-going long term critical cases from previous years.

# PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE

---

The San Francisco Public Defender's Office has been participating in the Family Violence Council as an "unofficial member" since its inception. The 2015 update to the Family Violence Council Ordinance officially added the Public Defender to the Council.

The Public Defender's Office in San Francisco utilizes a "holistic model" of indigent defense services, focusing not only on legal representation, but also on helping clients address the root causes of problems that may have led to their arrest. The Public Defender recognizes that contact with the criminal justice system offers a rare moment in which to address an individual's needs, including those beyond the realm of the legal system. By taking advantage of the unique relationship as a counselor to the client, public defenders can refer individuals to services for addiction, mental illness and unemployment, thereby providing alternatives to incarceration that promise better client, family, and community outcomes through decreased recidivism and healthier reentry into communities.

San Francisco Deputy Public Defenders are trained in evidence-based practices and understand the wide range of service needs of their clients. They are effective advocates for the use of alternative sentencing strategies and equally well versed in the legal issues and advocacy techniques required in the criminal justice process. Deputy Public Defenders are also responsible for identifying clients who are eligible for collaborative courts and other evidence based programs aimed at improving social and legal outcomes.

## **Children of Incarcerated Parents Program**

Public Defender clients in the county jail avail themselves to the services of the Children of Incarcerated Parents Program, which is part of the office's Reentry Unit. The goals of these services are to insulate children from the risks associated with parental incarceration, maintain family bonds through the period of incarceration, and improve the ability of clients to participate in family life upon their release. The Children of Incarcerated Parents Program staff works with clients, their families, deputy public defenders, Human Services Agency, Child Support Services, Family Court, and a network of community-based treatment providers to respond to the needs of incarcerated parents and their families. The staff is uniquely positioned to address family needs that are created when a parent is taken into custody. Services provided include addressing the urgent needs of children, setting up contact visitation, assisting clients with family court issues, child support, reunification plans, connecting clients with Child Protective Services case managers, and connecting clients and their families to additional social services. Since its inception in 2000, the Children of Incarcerated Parents Program has helped hundreds of families in San Francisco overcome the numerous obstacles created as a result of the incarceration of a family member.

*The Family Violence Council has made effort to seek education on Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). Parental incarceration is a childhood trauma that can lead to future adverse health outcomes without adequate support.<sup>35</sup> Department of Public Health representative Dr. Leigh Kimberg presented to the Council on ACEs and toxic stress in February 2015, fulfilling a recommendation for the Department on the Status of Women from the 2012/2013 report.*

### **Clean Slate Program**

The office's Clean Slate Program assists over 5,000 individuals each year who are seeking to "clean up" their records of criminal arrests and/or convictions. Clean Slate helps remove significant barriers to employment, housing, public benefits, civic participation, immigration and attainment of other social, legal and personal goals. The program, now in operation for over a decade, prepares and files over 1,000 legal motions in court annually, conducts regular community outreach, distributes over 6,000 brochures in English and Spanish, and holds weekly walk-in clinics at five community-based sites, in predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods most heavily impacted by the criminal justice system. The Clean Slate Program has been instrumental in helping individuals obtain employment and housing, factors that help stabilize and strengthen families.

### **Family Violence Prevention**

As shown by a growing body of scientific research, interventions that address the underlying causes of violent behavior and victimization are effective in preventing new instances of family violence. Without compromising the due process rights of individuals as guaranteed by the Constitution, the Public Defender is committed to utilizing evidence-based alternatives that address individual-level risks that perpetuate family violence. As a participating agency of the Family Violence Council, the Public Defender is committed to engaging in interagency collaboration and implementing preventative measures aimed at addressing family violence in San Francisco.

---

<sup>35</sup> The initial Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) Study was conducted at Kaiser Permanente from 1995 to 1997 in partnership with the Centers for Disease Control.

# SUPERIOR COURT

## Domestic Violence

Survivors of domestic violence can request a restraining order from the Family Law Division of the San Francisco Unified Family Court. Civil domestic violence restraining orders are available for cases involving a current or former intimate partner or spouse, a person with a child in common, or family to the second degree, which include in-laws but not cousins. The majority of persons requesting a domestic violence restraining order receive a temporary restraining order, which remains in place from the date of filing until a hearing scheduled within 25 days, to determine if a permanent restraining order will be granted. There are a number of dispositions possible at the hearing. Descriptions of these dispositions are available in the appendix of this report.

In Fiscal Year 2014, the Family Law Division of the San Francisco Superior Court received 1,220 requests for domestic violence restraining orders. Of these requests, 387 were granted: 32% of the total requests and 62% of requests that remain on calendar.

*Dispositions of Domestic Violence Restraining Order Requests  
Family Court  
FY2012-2014<sup>36</sup>*


	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Requests	1,258	1,182	1,220
Granted	414	339	387
Percent Granted	33%	29%	32%
Denied	112	132	82
Off Calendar	562	564	591
Other Disposition <sup>37</sup>	79	87	139
Pending	2	4	3

<sup>36</sup> The information in this table does not include restraining orders requested in Criminal Court as part of a criminal prosecution.


<sup>37</sup> Other Disposition includes cases continued per reissuance of order, dismissed, set for trial, advanced, or vacated.



*Restraining Orders Granted  
All Requests  
FY2014*




*Restraining Orders Granted  
Requests Remaining On Calendar  
FY2014*



**Elder Abuse**

In the past, the Probate Court exclusively granted restraining orders in cases of elder and dependent adult abuse. Elder abuse restraining order matters were moved to Civil Harassment Court in October 2011 when the courts made service cuts due to funding reductions. Among those cutbacks was that Probate Court no longer has court reporters, necessary for restraining orders, whereas Civil Harassment Court does have court reporters assigned to its calendar. However, if an elder abuse restraining order is requested for someone who is currently under conservatorship with San Francisco court, the Probate Court will hear that request. This shift *may* explain the decline in requests for elder abuse restraining orders, as more cases are being funneled to domestic violence or civil harassment and not categorized as elder abuse simply because the individual involved is over the age of 65. Restraining order requests can be submitted to protect any individual 65 years of age and older or for dependent adults who have physical or mental limitations that restrict their ability to carry out normal activities.


The Probate and Civil Harassment Courts received a joint total of 54 requests for elder or dependent adult abuse restraining orders in FY2014. The total number of requests has declined 32%. Of requests for restraining orders, 16 were granted: 30% of total requests and 36% of requests that remain on calendar. Only two requests were denied. Following the trend established in FY2013, the majority of these cases (76%) received other dispositions, which means they were continued, dismissed, or set for trial.




*Dispositions of Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse Restraining Order Requests  
Probate and Civil Harassment Courts  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Requests	83	79	54
Granted After Hearing	26	17	16
Percent Granted	32%	22%	30%
Denied	17	22	2
Off Calendar	15	15	9
Other Disposition	30	67	41
Pending	0	0	0

*Restraining Orders Granted  
All Requests  
FY2014*



*Restraining Orders Granted  
All Requests  
FY2014*



# Public Service Agencies

# DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

---

The Department on the Status of Women staffs the Family Violence Council and its various subcommittees. Highlights of the Department's family violence related activities in FY2014 include:

## **Housing and Domestic Violence**

As a result of advocacy from the Department on the Status of Women and the San Francisco Housing Authority, the City allocated funds for the first time in 2014 for two domestic violence advocates to be placed at the Housing Authority. The funds were awarded to La Casa de las Madres, who now has two staff out-stationed at the Housing Authority.

The Department on the Status of Women collaborated with attorneys from Bay Area Legal Aid and the National Housing Law Project to submit detailed comments to the San Francisco Housing Authority in connection with its Annual Planning process. The comments focused on implementing the changes required of public housing authorities by the 2013 Violence Against Women Act, as well as suggestions that came out of the Justice and Courage Housing Committee.

## **Domestic Violence Training**



In October 2013, the Department on the Status of Women trained approximately 100 human resources staff for the city of San Francisco on domestic violence in the workplace.

In May 2014, the Department on the Status of Women conducted a series of four three-hour trainings on domestic violence and child support enforcement for approximately 80 staff at the Department of Child Support Services. The trainings were co-taught by staff from the Riley Center, San Francisco Women Against Rape, and the Sheriff's Department Resolve to Stop the Violence Project. After the training, Department of Child Support Services personnel reported feeling more equipped to serve survivors of domestic violence in need of child support services.

The Department on the Status of Women also helped to coordinate training on domestic violence for all staff at the Housing Authority, along with partners from the National Housing Law Project, La Casa de las Madres, WOMAN, Inc., and Asian Women's Shelter. The training was offered four separate times in June 2014 to staff of the Section 8 Division and to all conventional public housing staff.

## Domestic Violence in the Workplace

The Department on the Status of Women, in partnership with the Human Resources Department, produced a brochure on Domestic Violence and the Workplace that was distributed to all city employees in October 2014. The brochure includes information on employment rights for abuse survivors in the workplace, safety planning in the workplace, as well as tips for co-workers on how to support a colleague who is being abused.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Workplace Safety Plan</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Create a plan of action to help protect employees</p> <p><b>Getting to and from the workplace</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the commute to and from work safe?</li> <li>• Are the parking arrangements at work safe? Can the employee be given priority parking or a security escort from their car?</li> <li>• Can someone walk the employee to public transit?</li> <li>• Consider additional security measures for entering and exiting the workplace.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office space safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the employee need a new work phone number or call screening system? Can his/her name be removed from phone directories?</li> <li>• Is the employee's work area away from public access, stairs, and elevators? Can barriers be put between the entrance and the work area?</li> <li>• What alternate escape route exists for use if the abuser comes to the workplace?</li> <li>• Can a code word be established to alert staff about a potentially dangerous situation?</li> </ul> <p><b>Leave and schedule issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a need for leave time?</li> <li>• Review the safety of childcare arrangements with the employee.</li> <li>• Can the employee work from home, if it is safe?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Restraining orders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the employee have a restraining order?</li> <li>• Does the restraining order name the work site as a protected location?</li> <li>• Can the employee provide a photo of the perpetrator to building security, or other identifying information, such as car type?</li> <li>• Do others in the office need to know a restraining order exists? Do they know how to respond if an abuser shows up?</li> <li>• Will the employee help the employer get a restraining order for the workplace if needed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Emergency contact information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What emergency contact information can the employee provide if needed?</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Support</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Support an employee or co-worker who is being abused</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain confidentiality unless there is a safety risk, work policies require you to report, or as otherwise required to report by law.</li> <li>• Let your colleague know that no one deserves verbal, emotional, or physical abuse.</li> <li>• Listen. Don't judge or criticize.</li> <li>• Let the employee know that you are concerned and want to be supportive.</li> <li>• Help the employee create a safety plan.</li> <li>• Allow the employee to make decisions. Do not try to solve the problem for him/her.</li> <li>• Let the employee know about policies that provide protection.</li> </ul> <p><i>This pamphlet is intended as a reference guide and is not a substitute for legal advice.</i></p> <p>October 2014</p>	<p>City and County of San Francisco Mayor Edwin M. Lee</p>  <p>Department on the Status of Women Dr. Emily M. Morasse</p>  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Domestic Violence and the Workplace</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Information and resources for survivors of domestic violence and their colleagues</p> <p>Department on the Status of Women 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240 San Francisco • California • 94102 415.252.2570 (phone) • 415.252.2575 (fax) <a href="http://www.sfgov.org/dosw">www.sfgov.org/dosw</a></p>
--	--	--

# FAMILY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES

---

San Francisco Family and Children's Services, also known as Child Protective Services (CPS), is a division of the Department of Human Services within the Human Services Agency that protects children from abuse and neglect, and works in partnership with community-based service providers to support families in raising children in safe and nurturing homes. Whenever possible, Family and Children's Services helps families stay together by providing a range of services from prevention through aftercare, to keeping children safe with their families or with families who can provide permanency.

Researchers from the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) at the University of California at Berkeley aggregate and provide access to all child welfare data for the state on an annual basis as part of a joint venture between the University and the California Department of Social Services. The data from 2013 included in this section comes from this database.<sup>38</sup> The data from 2014 was extracted from Family and Children's Services' case management system using SafeMeasures, an analytic service provided by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.<sup>39</sup> Data in this section has been organized by calendar year rather than fiscal year.

## **Differential Response**

Family and Children's Services uses a method called "differential response" to respond to allegations of abuse. Based on information received during a hotline call or referral, Family and Children's Services social workers assess the evidence of neglect or abuse. If there is insufficient evidence to suspect neglect or abuse, the case is "evaluated out of the system" and the family may be referred to voluntary services in the community. If there appears to be sufficient evidence of abuse or neglect, Family and Children's Services opens the case and conducts further assessment and investigation. Under this differential response model, the social worker taking the hotline report or referral determines the initial response path for all referrals. For details on common initial response paths, refer to the appendix.

---

<sup>38</sup> [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/)

<sup>39</sup> SafeMeasures <http://nccdglobal.org/analytics/safemeasures>

## Referrals and Substantiations


From calendar years 2012 to 2014, child abuse reports in San Francisco dropped by 27%. In 2012, child welfare services received 6,239 reports; in 2014, 4,524. The drop is likely tied to the out-migration of families. The total population of children in San Francisco is experiencing ongoing decline. There were 9,006 fewer children residing in the city in 2013 than in 2011.

Although the number of reports has declined, the percentage of reports substantiated as maltreatment has increased. The percentage of reports that were investigated by child welfare services and substantiated as maltreatment was 20% in CY2014, an increase from the 12% substantiation rate in CY2013.

*Referrals and Substantiations  
CY2011-2014*

	2012	2013	2014	%Δ from 2013
Total Children Referred	6,239	5,516	4,524	-18
Cases Substantiated	717	664	921	+28
Percent Substantiated	12%	12%	20%	+8%

*Substantiation Rate  
CY2010-2014*



### Allegation Types and Findings

Although the number of referrals has decreased slightly, allegation prevalence breakdown for CY2013 was similar to data from CY2010 through CY2012, fluctuating 1-2% year to year for all allegation types. Compared to the first four years of the decade, CY2014 saw a slightly higher percent general neglect (+7%) and slightly lower percentages for emotional abuse (-4%) and sexual abuse (-4%) allegations.


Consistent with history, the allegation most often substantiated in 2014, with 480 allegations investigated and found to meet the legal standards of maltreatment, was general neglect. This allegation often involves parents not providing basic care, attending to the child's medical needs, or providing enough food. The second highest, with 126 substantiations, was caretaker absence. Both allegations are often associated with parental drug abuse, with parents either diverting scarce resources or leaving their children alone to pursue their addiction.

*Referrals by Allegation Type  
CY2013-2014*


Allegation Type	2013	2014
General Neglect	1707	1716
Physical Abuse	1372	989
At Risk, Sibling Abused	1043	960
Emotional Abuse	700	416
Sexual Abuse	496	221
Caretaker Absence/Incapacity	151	183
Severe Neglect	34	37
Exploitation	13	2
Total	5,516	4,524



Referrals by Allegation Type  
CY2013



Referrals by Allegation Type  
CY2014



Dispositions by Allegation Type  
CY2013


Allegation Type	Substantiated	Inconclusive	Unfounded/ Screened Out	Not Yet Determined	Total Referrals
General Neglect	370	169	1167	1	1,707
Physical Abuse	58	107	1207	0	1,372
At Risk, Sibling Abused	65	56	919	3	1,043
Emotional Abuse	54	99	546	1	700
Sexual Abuse	27	14	455	0	496
Caretaker Absence/Incapacity	74	15	62	0	151
Severe Neglect	16	0	18	0	34
Exploitation	0	3	10	0	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>4,384</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5,516</b>

*Dispositions by Allegation Type  
CY2014*

Allegation Type	Substantiated	Inconclusive	Unfounded/ Screened Out	Not Yet Determined	Total Referrals
General Neglect	480	207	1,023	6	1,716
Physical Abuse	87	116	785	1	989
At Risk, Sibling Abused	103	64	788	5	960
Emotional Abuse	78	89	244	5	416
Sexual Abuse	30	41	150	0	221
Caretaker Absence/Incapacity	126	5	52	0	183
Severe Neglect	17	6	14	0	37
Exploitation	0	0	2	0	2
Total	921	528	3,058	17	4,524

**Maltreatment Allegations and Incidence Rates by ZIP Code**

The neighborhoods with the highest number of allegations were Bayview Hunter's Point (94124) with 951, Ingleside/Excelsior (94112) with 549, Mission (94110) with 500, and Visitacion Valley (94134) with 441 allegations. These four zip codes accounted for 44% of allegations, close to half of all child abuse allegations in San Francisco. The Financial District, Treasure Island, and Bayview ZIP codes had the highest rates of incidence per 1,000 children, which was consistent with 2012 ZIP code trends. However, the Financial District and Treasure Island communities have small child populations. There was a 10% decrease in the incidence of allegations per 1,000 children in San Francisco compared to 2012. This may be related to the two percent decline in the local child population. In comparison, the state of California experienced a four percent decline in the child population in 2013, yet a three percent increase in the incidence of allegations per 1,000 children.



Bay View; Ingleside/Excelsior;  
Mission; Visitacion Valley

*Child Abuse by ZIP Code  
CY2013<sup>40</sup>*

ZIP Code	Neighborhood	Child Population	Children with Allegations	Incidence per 1,000 Children
94124	Bayview	8,543	951	111.3
94112	Ingleside/ Excelsior	14,589	549	37.6
94110	Mission	10,519	500	47.5
94134	Visitacion Valley	8,522	441	51.7
94115	Pac Heights/Western Addition/Japantown	3,967	183	46.1
94102	Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	2,739	153	55.9
94107	Potrero Hill	3,181	187	58.8
94103	SOMA	2,609	161	61.7
94109	Nob Hill/Russian Hill	3,633	140	38.5
94132	Lake Merced	3,787	113	29.8
94133	North Beach/Fisherman's Wharf	2,765	98	35.4
94117	Haight/Cole Valley	3,921	100	25.5
94130	Treasure Island	576	94	163.2
94127	West Portal	3,621	73	20.2
94118	Inner Richmond	5,770	53	9.2
94131	Twin Peaks/Glen Park	4,173	80	19.2
94108	Chinatown	1,064	29	27.3
94123	Marina/Cow Hollow	2,635	37	14
94116	Outer Sunset	6,926	42	6.1
94114	Castro/Noe Valley	3,385	20	5.9
94121	Outer Richmond	6,240	36	5.8
94122	Inner Sunset	8,121	40	4.9
94129	Presidio	833	10	12
94111	Embarcadero	294	3	10.2
94104	Financial District	26	7	269.2
94105	Embarcadero/SOMA	483	8	16.6
94158	Mission Bay	478	4	8.4
ZIP Code Missing	-	-	1,150	-
Out of County	-	-	254	-
San Francisco	-	113,400	5,516	48.6
California	-	9,354,439	482,383	51.6

<sup>40</sup> Data for 2014 is not yet available.

*Child Abuse: San Francisco and California  
CY2012-2013*

	2012		2013		%Δ from 2012	
	SF	CA	SF	CA	SF	CA
Child Population	116,074	9,697,339	113,400	9,354,439	-2	-4
Children with Allegations	6,239	486,991	5,516	482,383	-12	-1
Incidence per 1,000 Children	53.8	50.2	48.6	51.6	-10	+3

**Child Abuse Referrals and Foster Care Entries by Age Group**

In 2013 the largest age group of children reported was 11-17 year olds, accounting for 2,101 reports, followed by children birth to five with 1,771, and 6-10 year olds with 1,644. Again, the total number of child abuse referrals dropped by 27% from 2012 to 2014.


When looking at actual entries into foster care, the highest number comes from the birth to five age group. In 2014, 0-5 year olds accounted for 194 entries, followed by 11-17 year olds with 125, and 6-10 year olds with 90 foster care entries. Although the number of children entering foster care increased 19% from 2013, the total number of children in foster care remained stable from 2013 to 2014, only declining six percent. This indicates that more children exited foster care in calendar year 2014.

The total foster care caseload has consistently declined overall by 66% in the last 16 years. In January 1998, there were 3,049 children in foster care in San Francisco. In January 2014, the total foster care caseload reached a low of 1,030. There are several changes that have likely contributed to this overall decline: San Francisco's decreasing child population, and new Family and Children's Services policies that emphasized early intervention and providing increased family support services to keep more children safely in their homes, when appropriate, rather than placing them in foster care.

**Age Group Statistics  
CY2013-2014**

Age Group	Child Abuse Referrals		Foster Care Entries	
	2013	2014 <sup>41</sup>	2013	2014
0 - 5	1,771	1,574	159	194
6-10	1,644	2,968	62	90
11-17	2,101		112	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,516</b>	<b>4,524</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>409</b>

**Total Foster Care Caseload  
Point-in-Time Data: January 1998-2014**




A significant change to the child welfare system that remains relevant today came with the passage of State Assembly Bill 12 (AB 12), the California Fostering Connections to Success Act, in August 2010. Under AB 12, eligible foster youth have the option to remain in care until age 21 and receive transitional support. This extended foster care program has been incrementally implemented over a three-year period. In January 2012, eligible youth were able to extend their foster care until age 19, and in January 2013, until age 20. With the passage of AB 787 in October 2013, as of January 2014 eligible youth were able to remain in foster care until age 21.

<sup>41</sup> SafeMeasures uses 0-5 and 6-17 categories. Total 6-17 year olds is 2,968.

### Trends in San Francisco School Reporters

In school year 2013-14, 1,308 child abuse reports came from school reporters. This marks an 18% decline in total reports compared to SY2012-13.<sup>42</sup> The majority of child abuse reports come from San Francisco Unified School District elementary schools, accounting for 658 (50%) of all school reports, followed by SFUSD high schools with 19%, and SFUSD middle schools with 13%. San Francisco private schools reported seven percent, and SFUSD child development centers reported five percent. These trends are the same as the prior three school years. Data for SY2014-15 is not yet available.



### Child Abuse Reports by School Reporters SY2011-2013

	SY2011-12	SY2012-13	SY2013-14	%Δ from SY2012-13
SFUSD Child Development Centers & Preschools	20	58	53	-9
Non-SFUSD Preschools & Day Care Centers	58	45	NA	-
SFUSD Elementary Schools	725	802	658	-18
SFUSD Middle Schools	270	231	171	-26
SFUSD High Schools	325	321	245	-24
Private Schools	120	130	94	-28
SFUSD Admin	NA	NA	29	-
Other School District	NA	NA	27	-
Other (No School Identified)	NA	NA	31	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>1,587</b>	<b>1,308</b>	<b>-18</b>

<sup>42</sup> SY indicates school year.

# CaIWORKs DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVOCATES

The California Department of Human Services under the aegis of the San Francisco Human Services Agency (SF-HSA) administers the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CaIWORKs) program to low income households with children.

The CaIWORKs program provides time limited cash assistance to families with children, nutritional assistance through CalFresh, and Health Insurance coverage through Medi-Cal, with an emphasis on moving clients from welfare to work through employment services. In preparing the work eligible adults to be gainfully employed or assisting them to acquire the skills needed to be employed, the County provides services that help them overcome significant barriers to employment such as drug addiction, alcoholism, mental health issues, and domestic violence.


The San Francisco Human Services Agency has partnered with the Homeless Prenatal Program, a community service provider, to provide domestic violence services since July 2012. The Homeless Prenatal Program provides supportive services such as counseling and case management services to enable survivors to achieve self-sufficiency. The domestic violence advocates are available at the San Francisco Human Services Agency offices as well as at the Homeless Prenatal Program premises.

San Francisco's CaIWORKs caseload has slightly decreased over the past few years. In FY2014, the caseload averaged 4,341 cases per month. The average monthly number of households in which clients received domestic violence case management and counseling services was 143, 42% fewer than in FY2012. Roughly three percent of CaIWORKs clients received domestic violence support services. The following table provides the monthly caseload for the fiscal years 2012-2014.

*CaIWORKs: Domestic Violence Advocate Caseloads  
FY2011-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Average Monthly CaIWORKs Caseload	4,729	4,468	4,314	-3
Average Monthly Domestic Violence Advocate Caseload	246	167	143	-14
Clients Receiving Domestic Violence Services	5%	4%	3%	-1%

*Average Monthly Domestic Violence Caseload*  
**FY2011-2014**






# ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES

---

The Department of Aging and Adult Services within the Human Services Agency operates the Adult Protective Services (APS) program for the City and County of San Francisco. Adult Protective Services is a state mandated, county administered program that is charged with responding to reports of abuse, neglect, exploitation, and self-neglect of elders over the age of 65 and adults between the ages of 18 and 64 that have physical, mental, or cognitive disabilities. APS social workers in San Francisco may collaborate with local law enforcement, emergency medical services, the District Attorney's Office, as well as experts from the Elder Abuse Forensic Center in order to effectively investigate and intervene in cases of elder and dependent adult abuse. APS social workers assist their clients to maintain the greatest level of independence possible while promoting their health, safety, and well-being.

The 2012 US Census found that 14% of the total population in San Francisco is 65 or over, which is higher than the California average of 12%. The Center of Excellence on Elder Abuse and Neglect affiliated with the University of California, Irvine estimates that an elder or dependent adult is abused once every three minutes in California. Abuse of the "oldest old," those individuals over 85 years of age, is believed to occur at a higher rate than other elders, and family members are the most common perpetrators of abuse towards these individuals.

Financial abuse is an area of increasing concern in San Francisco, across the state, and throughout the county. A recent study by True Link, a San Francisco based financial services firm that helps seniors and their families protect themselves from fraud, exploitation, and financial abuse, found that elders in the United States lose more than 36 billion dollars a year to financial abuse.<sup>43</sup> Within California's statewide system, financial abuse cases rose 41% between 2009 and 2014. In FY2014, San Francisco APS investigated 772 allegations of financial abuse. APS workers are confirming financial abuse through the investigation process at higher rates than in years past. Between FY2012 and FY2014, the number of allegations of financial abuse APS substantiated rose by 27%.



---

<sup>43</sup> Orlov, Laurie, and True Link Data Science Team. *The True Link Report on Elder Financial Abuse 2015* (2015). *True Link Financial*. True Link Financial, Jan. 2015. Web. 28 Apr. 2015.

Overall, APS workers substantiated more cases of abuse than in prior years, suggesting that the acuity of cases that APS is investigating may be rising. This is noteworthy because a higher number of allegations were found to have substantiated or confirmed abuse even though the number of referrals decreased slightly between FY2013 and FY2014. There were 22% more confirmed unique cases of abuse by others in FY2014 than in FY2012. When looking solely at allegations of self-neglect, APS workers confirmed 20% more allegations in FY2014 than in FY2012.<sup>44</sup>

*Referrals and Substantiations  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Cases Received	5,924	6,455	6,207	-4
Cases Substantiated	1,821	2,046	2,190	+7
Percent Substantiated	31%	32%	35%	+3%

*Elder Abuse & Dependent Adult Abuse: Case Breakdown  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012		FY2013		FY2014	
	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse
Cases Received	4068	1856	4531	1924	4,307	1,900
Cases Substantiated	1307	514	1487	559	1,586	604
Percent Substantiated	32%	28%	33%	29%	37%	32%

*Confirmed Cases of Self-Neglect  
FY2012-2014*


Type of Case	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Elder Abuse	850	993	1,105	+10
Dependent Adult Abuse	363	410	406	-1
Total	1,213	1,403	1,511	+7

<sup>44</sup> Self-neglect may occur concurrently with abuse by others.


**Confirmed Cases of Abuse by Others  
FY2014**

Type of Abuse	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse	Total
Psychological/Mental	332	131	463
Financial	288	69	357
Neglect	140	44	184
Physical	132	69	201
Isolation	13	6	19
Abandonment	10	4	14
Sexual	2	13	15
Abduction	0	0	0
<b>Total Counts of Abuse<sup>45</sup></b>	<b>917</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>1,253</b>
<b>Total Unique Cases</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>962</b>

**Elder Abuse  
FY2014**



**Dependent Adult Abuse  
FY2014**



<sup>45</sup> There may be multiple types of abuse in a single case.


*Confirmed Cases of Abuse by Others  
FY2012-2013*

Type of Abuse	FY2012			FY2013		
	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse	Total	Elder Abuse	Dependent Adult Abuse	Total
Psychological/Mental	257	93	350	307	80	387
Financial	237	44	281	256	50	306
Neglect	115	34	149	126	31	157
Physical	109	67	176	100	69	169
Isolation	9	0	9	18	5	23
Abandonment	9	0	9	9	2	11
Sexual	4	7	11	1	6	7
Abduction	0	1	1	1	0	1
Total Counts of Abuse	740	246	986	818	243	1,061
Total Unique Cases	573	182	755	625	184	809

*Confirmed Cases of Abuse by Others: Unique Cases  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Elder Abuse	573	625	708	+12
Dependent Adult Abuse	182	184	254	+28
Total	755	809	962	+16

*Abuse by Others: Unique Confirmed Cases  
FY2012-2014*



# DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

---

The San Francisco Department of Public Health strives to reduce family violence both through public health prevention programs and by directly addressing family violence with patients seen in the Department of Public Health network of hospitals and healthcare clinics. Healthcare providers may be the first or only professionals to encounter and provide services to many victims of family violence. Although some victims of family violence may present with obvious injuries during a healthcare visit, it is far more common that they present with only subtle symptoms of repeated abuse or violence like chronic pain, depression, or exacerbation of chronic health problems. Therefore, treating and preventing family violence requires extensive training of healthcare staff, protocols to use in screening for and responding to family violence, and the development of educational materials for healthcare providers and staff.

Data on all forms of family violence in the healthcare setting can be captured in multiple different ways. Mention of family violence (child abuse, intimate partner violence, elder abuse) may be made in the text of a paper or electronic healthcare note. With charting of violence in the textual portion of a note, information on violence must be extracted by reading each healthcare note and, thus, is impossibly time-consuming to collect. Other ways of capturing data include the development of specific “standardized fields” in an electronic medical record that can be filled out to capture the results of a violence “screening” done by healthcare staff or providers. This method of capture makes digital extraction of the data possible. Yet healthcare providers may not fill out this “standardized field.” Finally, another way to capture data on all forms of family violence is through “billing code data” (called “ICD codes”). These are codes that describe the diagnoses made and counseling done during a healthcare encounter for purposes of billing. There are many diagnostic and counseling codes related to family violence. National data strongly suggests that these codes are underutilized in healthcare settings. (So, for example, a provider may code a “fracture” that was the result of abuse but not the abuse itself).

Both the San Francisco General Hospital Emergency Department and the Department of Public Health outpatient clinics have begun to document intimate partner violence in standardized fields in newly adopted electronic medical records systems. Because learning to use new electronic medical record systems is quite challenging, it is not expected that there will be a high level of documentation during the first few years. The Department of Public Health is committed to continuous improvement of these data collection systems as described in the 2012-2013 Family Violence Council Report.

The San Francisco General Hospital Emergency Department (SFGH ED) screens for intimate partner violence with triage nurses and other healthcare providers asking each patient about his/her intimate partner violence experiences. All patients identified as, or suspected to be, victims of intimate partner violence are offered treatment, counseling, and referrals to community

services. Department of Public Health will provide SFGH ED data on a bi-annual basis beginning with the next Family Violence Council Report.

The Department of Public Health outpatient primary care and Women’s clinics also have an intimate partner violence protocol that was endorsed by the San Francisco Health Commission in 1998, mandating that healthcare providers in each clinic routinely screen for and address intimate partner violence with their patients. As with the San Francisco General Hospital Emergency Department model, all patients identified as, or suspected to be, victims of intimate partner violence are offered treatment, counseling, and community resources.

In the new outpatient electronic medical record system, Department of Public Health established “searchable” fields for: (1) Physical and emotional intimate partner violence; (2) Sexual abuse by an intimate partner or another person; and (3) Contraceptive coercion (whether a partner tried to interfere with contraceptive method or tried to force a female patient to become pregnant). The electronic record system has been implemented incrementally beginning with just three primary care clinics in FY 2011-2012. Currently, fourteen primary care clinics are utilizing the new electronic medical record system. Training in the use of the intimate partner violence and contraceptive coercion fields has begun and will be gradually expanded throughout primary care.

*Department of Public Health  
Outpatient Primary Care Clinic Statistics\*  
FY2013-2014*

	FY 2013	FY 2014	%Δ from FY2013
Female Clients Screened: (number of female clients with completed standardized field in at least 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	1,682	970	-42%
Female Clients with <u>Current</u> intimate partner violence: (number female clients with positive screen in any 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	52	17	-67%
Female Clients with <u>Past</u> intimate partner violence: (number of female clients with positive screen for past abuse >1 year ago , in any 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	148	78	-47%
Male Clients Screened: (number of male clients with completed standardized field in at least 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	603	82	-86%
Male Clients with <u>Current</u> intimate partner violence: (number male clients with positive screen in any 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	5	0	-100%
Male Clients with <u>Past</u> intimate partner violence: (number of male clients with positive screen for past abuse >1 year ago , in any 1 of the 3 categories of abuse)	15	1	-93%

\*Clinics included in report: GMC, CHC, CMHC, FHC, MHHC, PHHC, SAFHC, TWUHC

To attempt to provide additional data for the 2012-2013 Family Violence Council report, an audit of diagnosis and counseling codes that refer to elder abuse and intimate partner violence was done at Laguna Honda Hospital. This audit revealed that data on elder abuse and intimate partner violence is not being captured by current coding practices. Further investigation revealed that, upon admission to Laguna Honda Hospital, data is collected and documented as mandated by a federal intake form called the "Minimum Data Set for Nursing Home Patient Assessment" or "MDS." Data from the MDS is transmitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. Review of this federally mandated form reveals that the MDS does not include any questions related to elder abuse or intimate partner violence. Thus, data collection for this report has highlighted a federal policy that should be examined and addressed. This initial audit also prompted a pioneering pilot quality improvement project to improve intimate partner violence and elder abuse programs at Laguna Honda Hospital that was designed in 2014 and will be implemented in 2015-2016.

Because many survivors of family violence do not feel safe or ready to disclose their experiences of abuse when asked by a healthcare provider, not all family violence survivors may be identified in the healthcare setting. Once survivors of family violence and sexual assault are identified within the Department of Public Health system, they are treated by their primary health care team and referred to community services. However, there are also a number of trauma-specific treatment programs within Department of Public Health to assist patients in recovering from the physical and emotional trauma they have experienced. This report includes data from the Trauma Recovery Center, the Child Abuse Intervention Program, and the Child Trauma Research Program.

### **Trauma Recovery Center**

The Trauma Recovery Center provides mental health and case management services to survivors of interpersonal violence, including intimate partner violence, sexual and other physical assaults, gang-related violence, and more. The Trauma Recovery Center served 715 clients during FY2014. These clients received 7,145 units of service. Services included patient assessments/intakes, crisis services, case management, individual and group counseling, medication monitoring, and other miscellaneous services.

During FY2014, the Trauma Recovery Center received 666 new referrals. As some referral calls are received after hours, demographic information for gender, race, and type of trauma may not be collected on all referrals. The majority of clients were female (60%) and survivors of sexual assault (60%). The Center saw 12 clients that were family members of victims. The mean age was 36. The full client population demographics follow.



**Trauma Recovery Center: Client Statistics  
FY2012-2014**

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
Clients Served	738	742	715	-4
New Clients	NA <sup>46</sup>	NA	666	-
Units of Service	NA	NA	7,145	-

**Trauma Recovery Center  
Client Statistics by Race**

Race	FY2014
White	186
Latina/o	151
African American	106
Asian Pacific Islander	31
Native American	3
Mixed Race	29
Other	54
Unknown/Uncoded	97
Declined to Answer	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>666</b>

**Trauma Recovery Center:  
Client Statistics by Gender**

Gender	FY2014
Female	393
Male	211
Unknown/Omitted	48
Transgender: M to F	13
Transgender: F to M	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>666</b>

**Trauma Recovery Center:  
Client Statistics by Type of Trauma  
FY2012-2014**

Trauma	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Sexual Assault	379	372	354
Other Assaults <sup>47</sup>	359	370	195
Domestic Violence			25
<b>Total</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>574<sup>48</sup></b>

<sup>46</sup> Not Available

<sup>47</sup> Shootings; stabbings; physical assault; other. Data was not broken out between other assaults and domestic violence before FY2013-2014.

## Child Abuse Intervention Program

The Child Abuse Intervention Program is designed in accordance with the California Penal Code as a condition of probation for those convicted of a violation of child abuse. Clients are mandated by law to complete a minimum of 52 sessions of counseling, in a group setting, focusing on assisting clients to take responsibility for their child abuse offenses. The program includes child abuse prevention methods; anger, violence, and behavioral health treatment; child development and parenting education; substance use treatment referrals; psychiatric medication services; and case management. Few individuals are able to maintain perfect attendance due to a myriad of issues such as illness, substance use, schedule conflicts, holidays, facilitator absences due to vacation or illness, and session cancellations. Often, it takes much longer than a calendar year to complete. In the meantime, new group members join as they are referred after completing initial screening and intake. Thus, the membership of the group is fluid; clients graduate, withdraw, and join throughout the year.

The Child Abuse Intervention Program offered services to 19 clients in FY2014. Of those clients, three clients graduated from the program and five clients left treatment without completion due to various reasons including incarceration in another county, death, moving out of the area, illness, and removal due to failure to benefit from the program. By the end of FY2014, 11 individuals were enrolled. Criminal charges included child abuse (physical and mental) and/or endangerment in 13 cases and one case each of the following: abandonment, neglect, willful cruelty, false imprisonment, kidnapping, and sexual battery. In some of the cases involving endangerment, there were additional charges of abuse or willful cruelty and unjustifiable punishment.

*Child Abuse Intervention Program  
Client Statistics  
FY2014*

Total Clients Enrolled	19
Clients Remaining	11
Completed Treatment	3
Left Treatment	5

*Child Abuse Intervention Program  
Statistics by Criminal Charge  
FY2014*

Child Abuse/Endangerment	13
Child Abandonment	1 per charge
Child Neglect	
Willful Cruelty	
Neglect	
False Imprisonment	
Kidnapping	
Sexual Battery	

<sup>48</sup> Value does not reflect total clients served. As mentioned in prior text, demographic data was not collected for some clients due to after-hours referrals.

*Child Abuse Intervention Program: Demographic Statistics  
FY2014*

Age Range	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		
21-29	5	Male	12	African American	9
30-39	4			Caucasian	4
40-49	6			Asian/Pacific Islander	3
50-59	3	Female	7	Hispanic	2
60-64	1			Other	1

**Child Trauma Research Program**

The Child Trauma Research Program is a program of the University of California San Francisco, Department of Psychiatry that serves families at San Francisco General Hospital and at community centers throughout San Francisco. The Child Trauma Research Program provides assessment and intensive mental health services to children birth through five years of age who have been exposed to trauma, including family violence.

During FY2014, 290 children received services at the Child Trauma Research Program. It is important to note that most children exposed to any trauma are exposed to multiple forms of trauma. In FY2014, 216 (74%) of the children treated had experienced multiple traumas. The primary traumas that led to referrals of children to the Child Trauma Research Program were: 102 for exposure to domestic violence, 10 for physical abuse, 9 for sexual abuse, 9 for neglect, 11 for exposure to community violence, 11 due to the death of someone close, 25 for separation from a primary caregiver, 34 children for other trauma exposures that did not fall into the above categories, and 79 for unknown traumas (brief referral information). Of the 290 families treated, 85 of these families were referred in FY2013 but continued to receive services in FY2014.

*Child Trauma Research Program Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Families Served by CTRP at SFGH & Community Centers	271	282	290 <sup>49</sup>

<sup>49</sup> 85 families were referred in FY2012-2013 but continued services in FY2013-2014.

**Child Trauma Research Program: Statistics by Type of Trauma  
FY2012-2014**

Primary Type of Trauma Endorsed <sup>50</sup>	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Domestic Violence	136	144	102
Separation from Primary Caregiver	42	45	25
Physical Abuse	16	17	10
Community Violence	16	11	11
Loss of Close Relation	14	14	11
Sexual Abuse	14	17	9
Child Neglect	19	14	9
Other traumas	14	20	34
Unknown traumas	NA	NA	79

**Child and Adolescent Support Advocacy and Resource Center**

The Child and Adolescent Support Advocacy and Resource Center (CASARC) is the Department of Public Health/UCSF partner for the Children’s Advocacy Center (CAC). CASARC provides services for the CAC including forensic medical exams and interviews, mental health evaluation and treatment, and referrals. The CAC is described in further detail in the Child Abuse Prevention and Support Services Section.

<sup>50</sup> 216 children (74% of all children served) had experienced multiple traumas.

# DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES

---

The San Francisco Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) works with parents and legal guardians to ensure that families receive the court-ordered financial and medical support they need to raise their children. DCSS helps children and their families by locating absent parents, establishing paternity, and requesting and enforcing child support orders. During FY2014, DCSS provided case management services for 13,271 child support cases.

## Family Violence Initiative

In cases where domestic violence or family violence has occurred, enforcing child support obligations can elevate risk for survivors of abuse and their children. Therefore, DCSS developed the Family Violence Indicator for case managers to flag cases in which the enforcement of support obligations may be dangerous.<sup>51</sup> The number of cases identified with the Family Violence Indicator more than tripled from FY2010 to FY2011, increasing from 569 to 1,721. This represented 11% of the overall DCSS caseload, compared to 3% previously. Since FY2011, this 11% caseload for cases flagged with Family Violence Indicator has remained steady, though the number of cases has decreased slightly to 1,536 in FY2014.

### *Caseload Statistics: Family Violence Indicator FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Open cases at Fiscal Year-End	14,520	13,856	13,271
Cases flagged with Family Violence Indicator <sup>52</sup>	1,611	1,574	1,536
Percent of caseload flagged with Family Violence Indicator	11%	11%	11%

<sup>51</sup> When a case participant (noncustodial or custodial party) claims family violence, the case manager marks the case with a Family Violence Indicator in the Child Support Services database. This automatically updates the information in the records for any dependent children in that family as well as the case participant.

<sup>52</sup> The Family Violence Indicator counts listed are unique case counts, not participant counts. The count of individual participants with Family Violence Indicators is greater than the count of cases with Family Violence Indicators. For example, if a case participant with one dependent child makes a claim of family violence, the Family Violence Indicator would be marked at both the case and participant levels, for a Family Violence Indicator case count of one and a Family Violence Indicator participant count of two.

The dramatic increase in the number of cases flagged with the Family Violence Indicator in fiscal year 2011 prompted DCSS to create a ground-breaking special enforcement solution to ensure the safety and well-being of custodial parents who rely on child support to care for their children, but whose cases could qualify for good-cause closure due to the likelihood of intimidation, threats, or violence by the noncustodial parent in response to a child support order. In July 2011, DCSS launched its Family Violence Initiative case management model which introduced strategies to support special handling of cases that are flagged with the Family Violence Indicator.

In calendar year 2014, domestic violence survivors received over three million dollars in child support payments. San Francisco's overall performance for child support payment compliance is 73%, and the cases managed under the Family Violence Initiative perform comparably. DCSS has not received any new reports of family violence towards the custodial parents or children on this caseload. Further efforts by DCSS to increase participation and compliance for cases with family violence history are ongoing.

### **Cross Department Collaboration**

DCSS also works closely with the Adult Probation Department on cases in which noncustodial parents are on probation or incarcerated for domestic violence. This collaboration allows both departments to work with noncustodial parents to ensure that they meet their support obligations and remain in compliance with their probation terms.

DCSS entered into collaboration with San Francisco Victim Services Division in July 2013 to provide enhanced, as needed, child support services to victims receiving services through Victim Services. DCSS individually handles those cases, providing specialized attention and enhanced customer service through timely administration of child support services.

In 2014, DCSS engaged the Department on the Status of Women to develop and deliver Domestic Violence Training to all DCSS front-line staff. The intent was to empower staff with the tools to understand and recognize situations where domestic violence may be a factor for DCSS customers; when and where to refer customers for support services; and how to provide services safely; and the impact of domestic violence on customers and the community as a whole.

In 2015, DCSS shared its specialized caseload model and domestic violence curriculum at a conference for staff from child support departments across the state, completing a recommendation from the 2012/13 report. The curriculum was also shared with federal child support officials.


# SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Student, Family, and Community Support Department (SFCSD) of San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) provides a broad range of specialized services and programs to support SFUSD students and their families beyond the classroom. SFCSD has a variety of prevention and intervention services to address the needs of students experiencing violence. Programs include: professional development opportunities for teachers and staff; violence prevention curricula for teachers; on-site Wellness Center Programs; Health Promotion Committees at the high schools and middle schools; health advocates and school social workers at the elementary schools; and grant-funded projects such as Support Services for LGBTQ Youth, Mentoring for Success, Foster Youth Services, Restorative Practices, and ExCEL After School Programs.

## Youth Risk Behavior Survey

Every two years, SFUSD administers the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS)<sup>53</sup> to a random sample of students across all SFUSD middle and high schools, and uses the data to examine risk factors present in students' lives. Data from the most recent survey, covering school year 2012-13, found among high school students who dated, rates of physical dating violence at 10% for students overall; rising to 25% for transgender students; and 30% for lesbian, gay, or bisexual students. Sexual dating violence occurred at 10% for students overall, 20% for lesbian, gay, or bisexual students, and spiked to 38% of transgender students. Physical violence was defined as being physically hurt on purpose one or more times during the past year. Sexual violence was defined as being forced to do sexual things that they did not want to do one or more times in the past year. The following graph shows the SY2012-13 violence prevalence results from a set of students who date.

*Physical & Sexual Dating Violence Prevalence SY2012-13*



<sup>53</sup> Standard CDC Youth Risk Behavior Survey Questionnaires can be accessed at: [http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/yrbs/questionnaire\\_rationale.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/yrbs/questionnaire_rationale.htm)

## **Violence Prevention Education**

As of May 2014, SFUSD had 539 school-wide health events reported for SY2013-14 across grades K through 12. “Violence Awareness” was among the top five focus areas for the presentations that were held, which included events such as workshops, student-led campaigns, and school-wide resource fairs, among others. Elementary school data on violence prevention education efforts for SY2013-14 follow. There were 955 violence prevention lessons of *Too Good for Violence*, an evidence-based curriculum taught across all SFUSD elementary schools. Other violence prevention lessons used in the classroom are “tribes,” “bully-free classroom,” “caring school community,” “kimochi,” “restorative practices,” and lessons developed by teachers.

SFUSD has designated November as “Violence Prevention” month and January as “Building Friendships and Healthy Relationships” month. During these months, SFUSD puts forth coordinated efforts to provide classroom curricula around peer violence, family violence, and teen relationship issues for its teachers to present to their students. Additionally, throughout the school year, Wellness Center staff, school social workers, nurses, health advocates, and LGBTQ support liaisons organize workshops at various elementary, middle, and high schools throughout the district. These workshops aim to educate, create public awareness, and equip students with tools and resources to recognize and address these issues as they present themselves in children’s lives.

## **Trauma-Informed Care**

SFUSD provides ongoing trauma-informed care training into SY2014-15. Since 2013, SFUSD has trained more than 120 school social workers, nurses, high school wellness coordinators, community health outreach workers, and other SFUSD staff. These trainings include:

- “Trauma 101: Addressing Complex Trauma in Schools: Strategies for Promoting School Success”
- “Introduction to Trauma—Trainer of Trainers”
- “Teacher Consultation Strategies for Trauma Sensitive Schools”
- “Mindfulness and Trauma”

Staff is also encouraged to join a trauma-informed Professional Learning Community (PLC) to examine ways they can assist their colleagues to be more trauma sensitive through, teacher consultation, presentations to the school community, and strategies to create safer school environments.



# Community-Based Agencies

# CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION & SUPPORT SERVICES

---

As San Francisco's Child Abuse Council, the San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Center collaborates with public and private partners to provide direct services and community education, and facilitate citywide strategic partnerships, with the common goal of preventing child abuse and reducing its devastating effects. Using a public-health approach, the Prevention Center collaborates across organizations to end abuse by addressing underlying risk factors and strengthening protective factors on both an individual and a population-wide basis. The Prevention Center is grateful to its partners, without whom the Prevention Center could not do its work, for its commitment to San Francisco's kids! Below we describe some of the Prevention Center's community's efforts to prevent and respond to child abuse.

## **Children & Family Services**

The Prevention Center's Children & Family Services (CFS) programs include individual and group parenting education; therapeutic childcare and early interventions; counseling and mental health services; case management; emergency needs support; and the **TALK Line**—a 24-hour support hotline to help parents and caregivers cope with the stress of parenting (415-441-KIDS (5437)). The Prevention Center provides data-driven, intensive, wraparound support to increase the protective factors shown to reduce abuse risk. In 2014, the Prevention Center took this innovative new "Integrated Family Services" program from a pilot of 13 to a full cohort of 50-60 families, with identified risk factors for abuse. CFS programs take place at the Center's 1757 Waller Street Family Resource Center (FRC), one of a citywide network of FRCs supported through the joint funding from Department of Children, Youth and their Families, Human Services Agency of San Francisco, and First 5 San Francisco.

## **Community Education**

Through the Child Abuse Council, the Prevention Center's community training programs teach thousands of elementary school children and hundreds of parents the tools to keep kids safe and train thousands of child-serving professionals to report suspected abuse.

## **The Safe Start Initiative**

The Prevention Center coordinates this citywide collaborative of FRCs (APA Family Support Services, Instituto Familiar de la Raza, and OMI Family Resource Center), Family Court, and the San Francisco Police Department's Special Victims Unit, to reduce the incidence and impact of exposure to community and domestic violence on children age six and under. Together, the

SafeStart collaborative expanded to serve 341 families in FY2014, a 38% increase from the prior fiscal year.

### Strategic Partnerships - Children's Advocacy Center

The Prevention Center's Strategic Partnerships activate public and private partners to create a movement to end child abuse in the community. A recent focus of this work is the Children's Advocacy Center of San Francisco (CAC), a public-private partnership between the Prevention Center and the Office of the City Attorney; Office of the District Attorney, Child Assault Unit and Victims Services Division; Human Services Agency, Family and Children's Services Division; San Francisco Police Department, Special Victims Unit; Department of Public Health through Child and Adolescent Support Advocacy and Resource Center (CASARC); Department of Public Health – Foster Care Mental Health; and University of California – San Francisco (CAC Partners).

The CAC builds upon this multidisciplinary team's decades of collaboration to respond to abuse. As lead agency of the CAC, the Prevention Center uses a collective impact approach to facilitate the development and implementation of shared priorities that further the CAC's mission: to set children on a solid path to healing by providing trauma-informed, efficient, and coordinated child-focused services. In calendar year 2014, the CAC provided coordinated forensic interviews and related support to 360 children and their families.



#### Child Abuse Prevention Center Statistics FY2012-2014

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from FY2013
TALK Line Calls Received	17,852	15,691	16,015	+2
Actively Engaged in Ongoing Phone Counseling	1,000	1,000	980	-2
SafeStart Families Served	232	209	341	+38
Children's Advocacy Center	-	-	360 <sup>54</sup>	-

<sup>54</sup> Data for the Children's Advocacy Center are from calendar year 2014.

## **Children's Advocacy Center Milestones: CY2014**

- *In October 2014, the National Children's Alliance accredited the CAC, the highest level of membership and validation of best practices, noting that San Francisco's was the only CAC to open and become accredited in under one year—an accomplishment made possible by dynamic collaboration and years of groundwork laid by CASARC and the multidisciplinary team.*
- *The City adopted legislation to fund space and associated costs of the CAC for nine years.*
- *CAC Partners identified the following strategic priorities for 2015-16: 1) expanding mental health services for CAC kids, 2) improving CAC coordination, 3) becoming a data-informed CAC, 4) educating the public about the CAC, 5) increasing CAC accessibility and 6) increasing CAC utilization.*
- *Through collaboration between the Department of Public Health (DPH, CASARC, and Foster Care Mental Health) and UCSF, the CAC Partners are creating an innovative mental health screening process to be made available to every eligible child that comes to the CAC, a pivotal step towards the long-term goal of ensuring that all CAC clients receive mental health screening, case management, and treatment.*

# DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION & SUPPORT SERVICES

---

## **Violence Against Women Grants Program**

Survivors of domestic violence often need significant support and resources to heal and rebuild a safer, healthier life. For victims of abuse, leaving the abusive relationship can be one of the most dangerous times, and San Francisco's network of supportive services play a key role in helping protect these victims. Survivors, friends, and neighbors called the community crisis hotlines three times as often as they called 911 in fiscal year 2014. Through the Violence Against Women Prevention and Intervention (VAW) Grants Program, the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) distributes City funding community agencies and collects statistics regarding the services provided.<sup>55</sup>

Overall the Department on the Status of Women funded 24 agencies and 32 programs in FY2014. These 32 different community programs provide advocacy, case management, counseling, crisis intervention, education, and legal services, among others. They provided a combined total of 25,967 hours of supportive services to an estimated 13,944 victims of violence.<sup>56</sup> The same client may receive services from more than one agency, so these are not unduplicated counts.

Though there were 34% fewer reported hours of supportive services in FY2014, this trend does not indicate an actual decrease in client services. The Department on the Status of Women has worked with its Partner Agencies to improve data collection and reduce the reporting of non-programmatic, administrative hours. Starting in FY2014, agencies are more accurately recording hours of direct services to clients.

The following table represents hours of supportive services and total clients served only for the 32 programs funded by the VAW Grants Program. The numbers do not represent total values for the entirety of services offered by the 24 partner agencies.

---

<sup>55</sup> Several other City departments, including the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and the Human Services Agency, also support certain services provided by San Francisco's domestic violence programs. The numbers reported here only reflect the agencies funded in part by the Department on the Status of Women.

<sup>56</sup> This figure includes solely VAW grant-funded services.

*DOSW Funded Supportive Services  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from 2013
Hours of Supportive Services	35,541	39,116	25,967	-34
Total Clients Served	NA <sup>57</sup>	NA	13,944	-

**Core Services**

The following data represent statistics from eight VAW Grants partner agencies that provide three core services: emergency shelter, transitional or permanent supportive housing, a crisis line, or a combination of these services. The diverse agencies represented include:

- Asian Women’s Shelter – emergency shelter and crisis line;
- Gum Moon Women’s Residence – transitional housing;
- Riley Center, Saint Vincent de Paul Society – emergency shelter, transitional housing and crisis line;
- Dream House, Jewish Children and Family Services – transitional housing;
- La Casa de las Madres – emergency shelter and crisis line;
- Mary Elizabeth Inn – permanent housing;
- San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) – crisis line; and
- Women Organized to Make Abuse Nonexistent, Inc. (W.O.M.A.N., Inc.) – crisis line.

The data presented represent services that reach adults and children who are survivors of violence. All agencies do not track data in exactly the same manner. For example, some shelters track individuals served or turn-aways by families, while others count women and children individually. Supportive services include direct services such as counseling, case management, legal and medical advocacy, and employment assistance; as well as prevention activities and training for providers, volunteers, and residents. Data for agencies providing these three core services represent the totality of program services provided by these eight partner agencies, rather than just services funded through VAW Grants.

**Emergency Shelter**

Emergency shelter statistics were gathered from Asian Women’s Shelter, Riley Center, and La Casa de las Madres. These shelters provided 19,145 bed nights and supportive services to 540

<sup>57</sup> The Department on the Status of Women did not track total clients served for VAW programs before FY2013-2014. Values for FY2011-2012 and FY2012-2013 are incomparable to FY2013-2014 because all individuals served were tracked together, including clients and non-clients, such as service providers seeking technical assistance or training from a Partner Agency.

women and children, including transgender survivors. Unfortunately, during the same time period, 2,602 individuals or families were turned away from shelters due to a lack of space. However, turn-aways decreased by 20% while bed nights and individuals served stayed relatively stable. This does not necessarily indicate a reduction in the number of survivors seeking emergency shelter.

### **Transitional and Permanent Housing**

The VAW Grants Program also partners with three transitional housing programs and one permanent supportive housing program. Statistics were gathered from Gum Moon Women's Residence, Dream House, Riley Center, and the Mary Elizabeth Inn. In FY2014, these four agencies provided a total of 17,925 bed nights and delivered support services to 364 women and children. There were 261 individuals turned away from these supportive housing programs due to a lack of space. Acknowledging the limitation that some agencies track by families and some track women and child individually, turn-aways for transitional and permanent housing programs decreased significantly (-68%), as in the case of emergency shelters. This decline can be attributed to the more than doubling of individuals served by these programs (+53%), though one agency reported lack of active application outreach due to staffing transitions from the end of 2012 to December 2013. However, number of bed nights declined 43%, which does not follow the emerging trend of serving more individuals. One agency attributed this contradiction to a decrease in the number of bed nights per individual or the average length of stay. Further study of client retention will clarify if the increase in individuals served yet decrease in housing bed nights is indeed due to a reduction in the length of housing stays across agencies.

### **Crisis Lines**

Crisis line statistics were gathered from WOMAN, Inc.; SFWAR; La Casa de las Madres; Riley Center; and Asian Women's Shelter. In FY2014, these five agencies received a total of 23,796 crisis calls, demonstrating the crucial need for this simple and confidential way for victims of violence to reach out for help. WOMAN, Inc. had the highest call volume at 11,524 calls in fiscal year 2014. Even with the tremendous volume of calls, it is important to recognize that victims of abuse may use other access points for services not specific to domestic violence and that some victims may never access any services at all.


### ***DOSW Selected Partner Agency Statistics – All Program Services FY2012-2014***

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	%Δ from 2013
<b>Emergency Shelter</b>				
Shelter Bed Nights	19,604	19,352	19,145	-1
Individuals Served	620	500	540	+7
Turn-aways	2,559	3,245	2,602	-20

Transitional & Permanent Housing				
Housing Bed Nights	26,713	31,685	17,925	-43
Individuals Served	182	170	364	+53
Turn-aways	794	823	261	-68
Crisis Lines				
Crisis Line Calls	32,612	24,461	23,796	-3

Though the total volume of crisis line calls has decreased 27% since FY2012, this change does not indicate a reduction of victims seeking help. The Domestic Violence Information and Referral Center (DVIRC) is an online interactive community network for domestic violence agencies across the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties. It was developed by WOMAN, Inc. in 2011. Starting with just a few agencies, this collaborative network has expanded to now close to 40 member agencies. The DVIRC provides a safe space for member domestic violence service providers to share, network, and access updated information, such as real time shelter bed availability, so that effective and appropriate resources and referrals can be offered to domestic violence survivors. The following figure is a sampling of DVIRC bed night hits and WOMAN, Inc. crisis line calls over the course of January to April 2014. As DVIRC hits increase, WOMAN, Inc. crisis line calls decrease, which indicates improvement in the utilization of the DVIRC, rather than a decrease in need for services.

*Domestic Violence Information and Resource Center (DVIRC):  
Effect on Crisis Line Calls  
January - April 2014*





# San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium

---

The San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium is comprised of 17 member-agencies and scores of allied organizations, City departments and individuals, all of whom are dedicated to ending domestic violence in San Francisco and beyond. The Domestic Violence Consortium's members' services include shelter, crisis lines, counseling, training, legal services and intervention classes.

The organization works to end domestic violence by amplifying the voices of advocates, community-based attorneys and survivors to have a positive effect on the allocation of resources, public policy and systems change.

The Domestic Violence Consortium's efforts are enhanced and accomplished by some of the following activities:

- Monthly convening of the domestic violence advocacy community;
- Ongoing Court Watches on domestic violence homicides and other cases requiring a community presence;
- Helping to organize service providers to speak with a united voice at City Hall;
- Participating in the Language Access Working Group with the San Francisco Police Department, Office of Citizen Complaints and Community Based Organizations;
- Participating in the Domestic Violence Workgroup with Human Services Agency;
- Partnering with the San Francisco Adult Probation Department to assist with auditing Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs);
- Working with local media to help understand the complexities of domestic violence.

The highlights of the Domestic Violence Consortium's work in 2014 include:

- Working on several pieces of Language Access legislation;
- Working to amplify the voices of immigrant survivors of domestic violence;
- Collaborating with San Francisco Police Department to complete its first Officer Involved Domestic Violence Policy;
- Continuing to be a robust presence with our Court Watch program;
- Helping to secure a 10% funding increase for the Violence Against Women service providers;
- Establishing an enhanced understanding and more in depth coverage of domestic violence by local media.

The San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium is honored to serve as a tri-chair and one of the founding members of the San Francisco Family Violence Council.

# ELDER ABUSE PREVENTION & SUPPORT SERVICES

The San Francisco Elder Abuse Forensic Center (SFEAFC) is a public/private partnership between the non-profit Institute on Aging and the following City and County of San Francisco Agencies: Department of Aging and Adult Services (Adult Protective Services and the Public Guardian), District Attorney's Office, City Attorney's Office and the San Francisco Police Department. The Institute on Aging is one of the Family Violence Council tri-chairs. The mission of SFEAFC is to prevent and combat the abuse, neglect and exploitation of elders and dependent adults in San Francisco through improved collaboration and a coordination of professionals within the elder abuse network. The data from SFEAFC represents a subset of APS cases. A formal referral process is utilized based upon the relative complexity of each case and/or the need for specialized consultation.

In FY2014, there were 45 new cases and 54 follow-up cases presented at the SFEAFC during 24 meetings. Demographic data on gender, age, race/ethnicity and zip code were identified in addition to categories of types of abuse. The average age of elder abuse victims was 77 and the median age was 79, demonstrating an age increase from an average of 74 and median of 77 in FY2013. The gender distribution indicated that 64% of victims were female and 36% were male. Caucasians (51%) and African Americans (29%) present the highest rates of abuse within the case population. It should be noted that multiple types of abuse are often found within a given case, so the numbers in the chart for types of abuse represent each instance of abuse and not number of victims. Prevalence data indicates that non-real estate related financial abuse, with 26 cases, is the most represented type of abuse. The second most represented type is self-neglect at 16 cases. The cases were fairly evenly distributed throughout San Francisco, except for a higher cluster occurring in the neighborhoods of Russian Hill (94109) and Ingleside/Excelsior (94112).

*Case Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
New Cases	40	36	45
Follow-Up Cases	64	72	54
Total Cases	104	108	99
# of Meetings	25	19	24


*Client Demographic Statistics  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
# of Females	25	22	29
# of Males	15	14	16
Average Age	78	74	77
Median Age	80	77	79

**New Cases: Statistics by Race  
FY2012-2014**

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Caucasian	20	16	23
African American	10	6	13
Asian	3	2	4
Latina/o	6	2	3
Pacific Islander	1	8	1
Native American	0	1	0
Other/Unknown	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>45</b>

**New Cases: Race Prevalence Statistics  
FY2014**



*New and Follow-Up Cases: Statistics by Elder Abuse Category  
FY2012-2014*

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014
Financial - Other	17	16	26
Self-Neglect	16	16	16
Neglect	11	7	12
Psychological	8	7	10
Physical - Assault/Battery	3	3	6
Financial - Real Estate	6	3	3
Isolation	4	1	3
Sexual	0	2	1
Abandonment	1	1	1
Abduction	0	1	1
Physical - Restraint	1	0	1
Other/Unknown	18	10	16
Total	85	67	96

**San Francisco Elder Death Review Team**

The San Francisco Elder Death Review Team consists of representatives from the San Francisco Medical Examiner’s Office, District Attorney’s Office, Police Department, Adult Protective Services, and the Elder Abuse Forensic Center. The primary role of the Team is to serve as a multidisciplinary case investigating committee providing in-depth analysis of the possible contribution of abuse and neglect to deaths of elders in San Francisco. It is also to strengthen system policies and procedures and to identify prevention measures to stop future incidents of elder abuse-related injuries and deaths. After a period of suspension, the Team began meeting again in August 2014.

# LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

---

Victims of family violence seek help and access services in many ways beyond those included in this report. The data contained in this report is meant to provide a broad overview of the scope of family violence in San Francisco. It does not, and cannot, include data from every agency and service with which these individuals may come into contact. The Family Violence Council is constantly looking to improve and expand the sources of data collected and referred to in this report.

There are other legal avenues for family violence cases in addition to the criminal justice proceedings outlined in this report. For example, cases of elder financial abuse may come under the jurisdiction of the Probate Court, and cases of child abuse fall under the jurisdiction of the Dependency Court. While these Civil Court statistics may overlap with those of the Criminal Court that are already included, there are some victims that choose to only pursue civil remedies. This data is currently not captured within the scope of this report.

Additional community-based organizations that are not included in this report also provide services to victims of family violence through the course of their work. Family Resource Centers and other family-focused programs in the community, particularly those serving families with children, may not be specifically designed to provide services to victim of family violence. However, advocates at these agencies are likely to be access points for victims and to provide services on an ad hoc basis, by way of the trusting relationships they often develop with their clients. It is important to identify these sites and agencies that can intervene in families where children are exposed to parental domestic violence, as exposed children are at increased risk for becoming involved in future violent relationships.

Identifying these information gaps further demonstrates the pervasiveness and complexity of the issue of family violence. However, despite these and other missing pieces, this report provides a broad overview for policy makers and advocates to use in assisting victims of family violence in San Francisco.

# STATISTICAL SUMMARY

## Selected Family Violence Statistics in Summary: 2014

	<i>Domestic Violence</i>	<i>Child Abuse</i>	<i>Elder Abuse</i>
Crisis Calls Received by Community Providers <sup>58</sup>	23,796	16,015	NA
Calls Received by 911, Family & Children's Services, & Adult Protective Services	8,437	4,556 <sup>59</sup>	6,340
Cases Substantiated by Family & Children's Services & Adult Protective Services	NA	921 <sup>60</sup>	2,190
Cases Received & Assessed by Special Victims Unit	3,383	401	189
Cases Investigated by Special Victims Unit	2,041	240	87
Cases Received by District Attorney's Office	1,536 <sup>61</sup>	142	NA <sup>62</sup>
Cases Filed by District Attorney's Office	288 <sup>63</sup>	69	39
Convictions by Guilty Plea & Probation Revocation	266	16	NA
Cases Brought to Trial	45	2	NA
Convictions After Trial	27	2	NA
Clients Assisted by Victim Services	1,306 <sup>64</sup>	289	258
Requests for Restraining Orders from Family, Probate, & Civil Harassment Courts	1,220	NA	54

<sup>58</sup> Call volumes were provided by domestic violence hotlines and TALK Line (child abuse). There is presently no dedicated community-based hotline for elder abuse.

<sup>59</sup> There were 4,525 child abuse calls received by Family and Children's Services during calendar year 2014 and 32 child abuse calls received by 911 in fiscal year 2014.

<sup>60</sup> Statistic for child abuse cases substantiated by Family and Children's Services is for calendar year 2014.

<sup>61</sup> All domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuse cases are managed by the DA's Domestic Violence Unit. The statistics for domestic violence and elder abuse are combined for the District Attorney's Office, except for cases filed.

<sup>62</sup> No statistics broken out for elder abuse, except for cases filed.

<sup>63</sup> Includes nine stalking cases filed.

<sup>64</sup> Includes children witnessing domestic violence.

*2013 U.S. Census Bureau Data*

San Francisco	Population Count <sup>65</sup>
Children Ages 0-17 Years	112,255
Adults Ages 18-64 Years	606,277
Older Adults 65 & Older	118,910
Total San Francisco Population	837,442

*2014 U.S. Census Bureau Data*

San Francisco	Population Count <sup>66</sup>
Children Ages 0-17 Years	114,231
Adults Ages 18-64 Years	617,187
Older Adults 65 & Older	121,051
Total San Francisco Population	852,469

---

<sup>65</sup> Calculated from U.S. Census Bureau 2013 population estimates program.

<sup>66</sup> Calculated from U.S. Census Bureau 2014 population estimates program.

# CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

---

Family violence continues to affect tens of thousands of San Francisco residents. Child abuse, domestic violence, and elder and dependent adult abuse are inter-related. In many families, more than one type of family violence occurs simultaneously. For example, it is estimated that 30-60% of families with domestic violence also have child abuse. Recent research at Family and Children's Services determined that 30% of the cases included families that had experienced domestic violence in the past, and 16% had experienced domestic violence in the last year. Children exposed to parental domestic violence experience significant trauma and are at increased risk for future victimization or perpetration of violence. Children who are physically abused are at increased risk of committing violent crimes later in life, including community or gang violence. Seniors experience domestic violence in addition to other forms of abuse. It is imperative that we examine and strengthen all of the systems of support and intervention discussed in this report and that the recommendations identified for 2016 are prioritized throughout respective organizations. Through collaborative policy and program improvement efforts we can increase the safety of all San Franciscans now and in the future.

This year, recommendations for the upcoming year are informed by trends identified in the data. These recommendations are summarized on the following pages. Recommendations from the 2012/13 Family Violence Council Report were informed by each department or agency's family violence-related objectives. Appendix A contains a summary of the status of these recommendations, some of which carry over from the 2011 report.



## Family Violence Council Recommendations for 2016

---

1. *Standardize a data collection protocol with agencies so that they are able to provide the same type of data each year*
  - The extreme fluctuation in data points from year to year in certain categories points to the need to create standardized data collection protocol for all Family Violence Council members.
2. *Focus on language access issues across the board*
  - Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 45 percent speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, and Russian.<sup>67</sup>
  - Thirteen percent of San Francisco households remain “linguistically isolated,” with no one over the age of 14 speaking English “well” or “very well.”<sup>68</sup>
  - Limited English Proficient survivors of family violence are particularly at risk for isolation from services, and may distrust or fear government agencies, requiring extra training and outreach to effectively serve these populations.
3. *Develop further training in best practices in responding to family violence for all agencies*
  - Our understanding of the most effective way to influence in family violence cases is constantly evolving, and requires ongoing collaboration and training on best practices.
4. *Develop an improved protocol with the Police Department and Adult Protective Services on investigating elder abuse cases*
  - In FY2014, the Elder Abuse and Financial Crimes Section of the Police Department received and assessed a total of 189 elder and dependent adult physical and financial abuse cases, 87 of which were investigated, whereas San Francisco Adult Protective Services received 6,207 cases and confirmed 2,190 of these cases.
  - The large disparity between Adult Protective Services and the Police Department’s caseloads indicate the need for better cross-referral policies.
5. *Add three inspectors to the Police Department Special Victims Unit, and assign an investigator specifically to elder financial abuse cases*
  - The 33 percent decrease from FY2013 to FY2014 in domestic violence cases investigated points to the need for more staff resources in the Special Victims Unit.
  - The 79 percent decrease in the Special Victims Unit Elder Financial Abuse caseload since FY2011 suggests the need for more dedicated staff resources to investigate elder financial abuse cases.
6. *Review the Police Department Special Victims Unit annually, to assess best practices for investigation of child abuse, elder abuse and domestic violence*
  - Issues of family violence are constantly changing. It is necessary to review the processes used to address these issues in order to ensure that the needs of victims are being met and that enough information is being gathered to establish strong cases.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Advancing Language Access in San Francisco: Language Access Ordinance Annual Compliance Summary Report, City and County of San Francisco, Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (March 2015).*

<sup>68</sup> *Id.*

## Appendix A: Status of Implementation of Recommendations from 2012/13

(Recommendations in grey carry over from the 2011 report)

	<b>Department</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	All	Create a Justice and Courage Committee within the Family Violence Council to continue the work of the Justice and Courage Oversight Panel.	<i>Completed. Meeting monthly.</i>
2.	All	Advocate for change in federal tracking through the MDS system to capture questions related to elder abuse and intimate partner violence. The MDS (Minimum Data Set for Nursing Home Patient Assessment) is a federally mandated healthcare intake form, which currently does not ask any questions related to elder abuse or intimate partner violence.	<i>Incomplete.</i>
3.	All	Develop a factsheet on family violence to distribute to San Francisco Unified School District.	<i>Incomplete.</i>
4.	Adult Probation Department	The Adult Probation Department plans to establish a victim/survivor program within the Probation Department that will work collaboratively with other City and County departments and victim/survivor services, which include, but are not limited to, the Sheriff Department's Survivor Restoration Program and the District Attorney's Office of Victim Services. The estimated cost of this program is \$800,000.	<i>In preliminary stages. Working title for program: APD's Community Restoration and Restitution Program.</i>
5.	Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors has committed to sending a Supervisor or staff member to Family Violence Council meetings.	<i>Completed. President Breed has designated one of her staff as the Family Violence Council representative.</i>
6.	Child Abuse Council	The Child Abuse Council will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to develop its scope by increasing the number of children served and expanding training of all referring partners on how to access the Children's Advocacy Center's services;</li> <li>• Provide services to expanded populations including Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) and children exposed to violence via community collaboration, training, and protocol development;</li> <li>• Improve mental health access for Children's Advocacy Center kids through</li> </ul>	<i>Ongoing. Policies being developed ensure that children with non-severe physical abuse, child witnesses to domestic and community violence are referred to the Child Abuse Council, in addition to the current referrals for sexual and severe physical abuse.</i>  <i>Ongoing.</i>  <i>Ongoing.</i>

		<p>mental health screening and follow up conducted by partners; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop shared database which provides information for providers working with children and also aggregate data used to direct systems improvement.</li> </ul>	<i>In progress. Anticipated completion: December 2015.</i>
7.	Commission/Department on the Status of Women	<p>The Commission/Department on the Status of Women will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend the Family Violence Council Ordinance to include the Public Defender's Office, Juvenile Probation, Animal Care and Control, and San Francisco Unified School District as official members;</li> <li>• Ensure the annual publication of the Family Violence Council report;</li> <li>• Include the status of girls in the Family Violence Council report; and</li> <li>• Organize a presentation for the Family Violence Council on the connection between Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and toxic stress.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Completed.</i></p> <p><i>Completed.</i></p> <p><i>Incomplete.</i></p> <p><i>Completed.</i></p>
8.	Department of Aging and Adult Services	<p>The Department of Aging and Adult Services plans to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a joint outreach campaign on all forms of family violence including child abuse, domestic violence, and elder abuse; and</li> <li>• Advocate at the statewide level for budget augmentation and legislation to strengthen the infrastructure of Adult Protective Services.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Incomplete. Funding and staffing issues are keeping the project from being initiated.</i></p> <p><i>APS partnered with the County Welfare Director's Association, the California Commission on Aging, and the California Elder Justice Coalition to support a 2<sup>nd</sup> budget proposal at the state level that requested to raise the funding for statewide training for APS from \$176,000 to \$5 million. Unfortunately, the proposal was not successful and no additional funding has been granted.</i></p>
9.	Department of Child Support Services	<p>The Department of Child Support Services plans to develop a training product to share with the community based on its models of collecting child support in families experiencing domestic violence.</p>	<i>In progress.</i>
10.	Department of Children, Youth, and Families	<p>The Department of Children, Youth, and Families has committed to:</p>	

	Youth, and Families	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on revising and refining its Violence Prevention and Intervention (VPI) funding to better meet the needs of youth involved with the juvenile justice system;</li> <li>• Continue to work with the Department of Public Health on this refinement work to prepare for its next funding cycle (DCYF is currently in year two of a three year funding cycle); and</li> <li>• Focus on the Family Resource Center which it funds through First 5 San Francisco, in hopes of collaborating with the Juvenile Probation Department on this refinement.</li> </ul>	<i>All of these items are in progress. Currently in a joint funding partnership with the Juvenile Probation Department and the Department of Public Health. Meet on a monthly basis to discuss issues that come up with current investments in services. Not releasing new RFP until 2017 so substantive refinement of funding strategies will not be complete before then.</i>
11.	Department of Emergency Management	Department of Emergency Management staff will receive refresher training on all three forms of family violence, including information on stalking, and explore the idea of training in partnership with other call centers in the area.	<i>Incomplete. Training scheduled for November.</i>
12.	Department of Human Services	The Department of Human Services plans to develop a joint protocol between law enforcement and child welfare on how to handle child abuse investigations and then facilitate trainings on this protocol.	<i>In progress. Anticipated completion: August 2015. Then must begin process of providing joint training on the protocol to agency personnel (will take 4-6 months).</i>
13.	Department of Public Health	<p>The Department of Public Health will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Become a national leader in its creation of a “trauma informed system of care” by training Department of Public Health’s 9,000 person workforce (1,700 in the upcoming year) on the principles of trauma informed systems; and</li> <li>• Continue to improve its intimate partner violence data collection system.</li> </ul>	<i>Completed/Ongoing. SFDPH has been recognized nationally for its leadership in creating coordinated public response to trauma and leading the way in the response of public systems in trauma informed systems work. In May 2015, the SFDPH Trauma Informed Systems workgroup attended the first ever convening on Trauma Informed Community Building coordinated by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). In addition, SFDPH was awarded a federal grant from SAMHSA as the lead agency in creating a 7 county Bay Area Trauma Informed System of Care. At SFDPH, a foundational training (now a requirement for all</i>


			<p>employees) will ensure that nearly 9,000 employees within the DPH system will have a shared understanding and shared language with which to respond to the impact of trauma. To date, just over 2,000 employees have participated in the training including early innovators like the Maternal Child and Adolescent Health section, Laguna Honda Hospital and Community Behavioral Health Services. Through workforce training and other components designed to embed knowledge and principles of trauma informed systems, SFDPH is preparing and supporting its workforce in realizing, recognizing and responding to the effects of trauma that affect our clients, our work with one another and our systems.</p> <p>SFDPH also continues to improve its ability to capture data related to violence and abuse. As described in previous reports, the SFGH Emergency Department, outpatient primary care clinics and Women's clinic routinely screen for and address intimate partner violence. In FY 2012-13, the outpatient electronic health record (EHR) system was implemented in eleven outpatient primary care clinics. In 2014, the EHR was implemented in three additional outpatient primary care clinics. SFDPH has created customized data entry fields for data related to intimate partner violence and reproductive coercion in this outpatient EHR. Training in the use of these standardized fields is ongoing.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<i>In FY 2014, a pilot project at Laguna Honda Hospital to improve upon the rates of intimate partner violence and elder abuse screening and documentation was designed and will be implemented in FY 2015.</i>
14.	District Attorney's Office	<p>The District Attorney's Office will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate California District Attorneys Association training on domestic violence with the Special Victims Unit (SFPD) for new attorneys;</li> <li>• Develop policies and protocols on elder abuse cases;</li> <li>• Develop legislation on elder abuse continuations to enable continuity of case staffing when a District Attorney who has been handling a case is busy with another case;</li> <li>• Continue collaboration with the Department of Human Services and the San Francisco Police Department at the Child Advocacy Center;</li> <li>• Facilitate California District Attorney's Association Child Sexual Assault and Physical Abuse training for staff; and</li> <li>• Develop protocols for family violence cases for the new courthouse dog.</li> </ul>	<p>Completed.</p> <p><i>In progress. Will be assigning a policy person and victim services person to assist in development of written policy.</i></p> <p><i>Sponsored SB 519 to accomplish this, but elder abuse continuances were removed from the bill.</i></p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p><i>In progress. Applying for new dog.</i></p>
15.	Domestic Violence Consortium	<p>The Domestic Violence Consortium plans to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue domestic violence court watch;</li> <li>• Work on language access with the Police Department;</li> <li>• Continue work with the Adult Probation Department on monitoring Batterer's Intervention Programs.</li> </ul>	<p><i>All of these items are ongoing.</i></p> <p><i>75 days of Court Watch in FY2014.</i></p> <p><i>New languages have been certified and many issues have been addressed.</i></p>
16.	Elder Abuse Forensic Center	<p>The Elder Abuse Forensic Center is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase attendance at the Forensic Center Multidisciplinary Teams (MDT) by 25%;</li> <li>• Make Adult Protective Services workers presenting in teams feel more comfortable;</li> <li>• Bring expert speakers on topics such as consumer law and Medi-Cal; and</li> <li>• Focus on elder abuse prevention.</li> </ul>	<p><i>All of these items have been completed. The Institute of Aging Elder Abuse Prevention program hosted a sold out conference in January on preventing elder financial abuse. Elder Abuse Prevention co-hosted with Legal Aid Association of California a follow-up webinar focusing on law enforcement's role in</i></p>

			preventing elder abuse. Elder Abuse Prevention is in the process of revising its elder abuse prevention materials so that they incorporate the latest research on elder abuse.
17.	Juvenile Probation Department	The Juvenile Probation Department plans to train 60 probation officers on responding appropriately to cases of child trafficking within the JPD system as well as investigate best practices.	<i>In progress. Training set to take place September-October 2015.</i>
18.	Mayor's Office	The Mayor's Office will light up city hall purple during the month of October for National Domestic Violence Awareness month.	<i>Completed.</i>
19.	Police Department	The Police Department plans to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procure referral cards for children when parents are arrested; and</li> <li>• Finalize policies for updated domestic violence general order and new officer involved general order.</li> </ul>	<i>Incomplete.</i>  <i>Completed: Department General Orders 6.09, 6.20, and 7.04.</i>
20.	Public Defender's Office	The Public Defender's Office will expand its community re-entry program for defendants since many have a history of abuse as well as work more closely to collaborate with other Family Violence Council agencies.	<i>Completed.</i>
21.	Sheriff's Department	The Sheriff's Department will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place inmates coming out of the Domestic Violence Court on the priority lists for the Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP) and the Sisters in Sober Treatment Empowered in Recovery (SISTER) Program;</li> <li>• Prioritize individuals with a history of family violence into the community re-entry program: No Violence Alliance Project (NoVA);</li> <li>• Provide case managers for persons who are victims of family violence;</li> <li>• Create new vocational programs for inmates with histories of family violence; and</li> <li>• Develop new programs for children of incarcerated parents.</li> </ul>	<i>Ongoing. RSVP participants with domestic violence offenses increased 27% in FY2014.</i>  <i>Ongoing.</i>  <i>Completed. The Sheriff's Department hired a full time case manager for incarcerated domestic violence survivors who is now posted at the Women's Resource Center and County Jail #2.</i>  <i>Completed. The Sheriff's Department works in collaboration with their 5 Keys Charter High School to bring new programs on board.</i>  <i>Completed. The visiting policy has been revised to expand opportunities for parent child contact visits and to allow</i>

			<i>unaccompanied 16 and 17 year olds to visit with their parents. Parent education is provided through a cognitive-behavioral parenting curriculum along with family transition circles using a restorative justice approach.</i>
22.	Superior Court	The Superior Court will continue to host justice partner meetings.	Ongoing.
23.	Unified School District	The Unified School District has committed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on LGBTQ youth who are disproportionately victims of violence;</li> <li>• Initiate a young men's health program;</li> <li>• Evaluate the status of dating violence, ensuring that LGBTQ and trans youth are included; and</li> <li>• Investigate best practices for supporting unaccompanied minors.</li> </ul>	Ongoing.  Completed.  <i>In progress. Information should be available late fall.</i>  Completed.





For more information, please contact:  
The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240 | San Francisco, CA 94102  
415.252.2570 | [dosw@sfgov.org](mailto:dosw@sfgov.org) | [sfgov.org/dosw](http://sfgov.org/dosw)



This report is available online at: <http://sfgov.org/dosw/family-violence-council>



City and County of San Francisco

# Commission on the Status of Women

Mayor Edwin M. Lee

Executive Director Emily M. Murase, PhD

**ANDREA SHORTER**  
President

**DEBBIE MESLOH**  
Vice President

**NANCY KIRSHNER-RODRIGUEZ**  
Commissioner

**JULIE D. SOO**  
Commissioner

**BREANNA ZWART**  
Commissioner

**EMILY MURASE, PhD**  
Executive Director

## COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

3 – 5 pm\* SPECIAL DATE and TIME

City Hall Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

### Members Present

President Andrea Shorter  
Vice President Deborah Mesloh  
Commissioner Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez  
Commissioner Julie D. Soo

### Staff Present

Executive Director Emily Murase, PhD  
Associate Director Carol Sacco  
Women’s Policy Director Minouche Kandel  
Executive Management Assistant Herschell Larrick  
Workplace Policy & Legislative Analyst Elizabeth Newman  
Policy Fellow Katie Veatch  
Policy Fellow Alana Rotti

### Members Excused

Commissioner Breanna Zwart

## I. CALL TO ORDER/ AGENDA CHANGES

President Andrea Shorter called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm.

She explained that Commissioner Breanna Zwart was traveling for work, and asked that she be excused.

*Action: To excuse Commissioner Zwart.*

*m/s/c (Soo/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

*Action: To reorder the agenda to move up items 3B, 6A, and 5.*

*m/s/c (Kirshner-*

*Rodriguez/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

*Action: To approve the meeting agenda.*

*m/s/c (Shorter/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Soo corrected the minutes to reflect Sarah Choy’s proper designation.

*Action: To approve minutes from August 26, 2015.*

*m/s/c (Shorter/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### B. Violence Against Women Prevention & Intervention Grants Program Funding for October 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 and July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017

Associate Director Carol Sacco presented the proposed Violence Against Women Prevention & Intervention Grant Program funding for October 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 and July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 for prevention and education services targeting Filipina and LGBT domestic violence survivors.

*Action: To approve the funding of Violence Against Women Prevention & Intervention Grants Program to selected applicants for October 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 and July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017.*

*m/s/c (Soo/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

### VI. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. Family Violence Council Report

Women's Policy Director Minouche Kandel presented the final *FY2014 Family Violence Council Report* for approval. Ms. Kandel provided an overview of the report's recommendations which were approved on September 2 by the Family Violence Council. Discussion focused on comparative data with other jurisdictions in California.

*Action: To approve the FY2014 Family Violence Council Report.*

*m/s/c (Soo/Kirshner-Rodriguez /Unanimous)*

### V. CONSENT AGENDA

*Action: To approve the Consent Agenda.*

*m/s/c (Shorter/Mesloh/Unanimous)*

#### 1. Resolution Recognizing Susan Gard for Domestic Violence Awareness Month

Ms. Gard thanked the Commission for the recognition and she expressed her appreciation for the role of Minouche Kandel in establishing this program. Commissioners thanked Ms. Gard for her dedicated service to the City and County of San Francisco.

#### 2. Resolution Recognizing Nancy Goldberg

Ms. Goldberg expressed appreciation for the recognition. She acknowledged the efforts of the Commissioners and others present at this meeting for their contributions to furthering the awareness of human trafficking. The Commissioners recognized Ms. Goldberg's dedication and perseverance in combatting human trafficking.

Antonia Lavine of the National Council of Jewish Women and SFCaHT thanked Commissioners for recognizing Ms. Goldberg and their work on this issue.

Carletta Jackson-Lane of the Sojourner Truth Foster Family Service Agency expressed gratitude for Ms. Goldberg's leadership.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS CONTINUED**

#### **A. Proposed Resolution on Comfort Women**

President Andrea Shorter gave remarks on the resilience of women from many backgrounds (African American, Native American) who have endured adversity. She stated that she was looking forward to hearing about the experiences of our Asian sisters.

She welcomed Victor Lim, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Eric Mar, who delivered remarks on behalf of Supervisor Mar who had a family emergency to attend to. Mr. Lim explained that an estimated 200,000 women and young girls were kidnapped and forced into sexual slavery during World War II by the Japanese Imperial Army. He stated that his office is working with a growing coalition of community leaders and that the goal is to erect a memorial on public property.

Mr. Lim introduced Ms. Yong Soo Lee, a "comfort women" survivor from Korea who was the first to bring global attention to the kidnapping and sexual abuse of women by the Japanese Imperial Army. She was kidnapped from her home and taken to Taiwan, to a "comfort station" serving Japanese kamikaze pilots. She survived electric shocks and knife wounds she suffered for refusing to work. At 88 years old, she is among 48 survivors in Korea. She has come to the US to share her story of the atrocities committed by the Japanese military during World War II. She has become an advocate so that other women would never have to suffer in the same way again. President Shorter thanked Ms. Lee for her powerful testimony.

#### **Public Comment**

1. Caryl Ito, former Women's Commissioner and President of the Commission, expressed surprise that Supervisor Mar did not consult with Japanese American leaders about the resolution, leaders such as Sandy Mori and Steve Nakajo. There is concern that the memorial will lead to divisiveness, not healing. Ms. Ito submitted to the Commission amendments to the resolution proposed by Supervisor Wiener.
2. David Monkawa of Nikkei for Civil Rights and Redress from Los Angeles talked about the struggle for reparations for the Korean comfort women. He discussed the opposition to the current monument located in Glendale (near Los Angeles). In response to the concern that there will be a backlash to the Japanese and Japanese American communities, and he said this was not an issue when the comfort women monument was erected in Glendale.
3. Judge Lillian Sing, the first Asian American woman judge in Northern California, explained that she retired as of yesterday, following 32 years of work as a judge. She was representing the Rape of Nanjing Redress Coalition and expressed disappointed at the Commission for not taking a position on this important issue.
4. Michael Wong of Veterans for Peace of San Francisco asked the Commission to stand up for the Korean comfort women. He emphasized the need to speak the truth.
5. Judge (ret.) Julie Tang expressed disappointment that the Commission has not taken a position on this issue. She stated that apologies should be defined by the victims. She urged support of the resolution as written, without amendment.
6. Nancy M. Lee stated that San Francisco stands for fairness. She urged the Commission to remember history. She expressed support for the memorial.
7. Judith Mirkinson of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom. Expressed shock that the Commission has not taken a position on this issue. She explained that the comfort women broke the silence around sex trafficking, and she urged support for the memorial.

8. Kathy Masaoka, Co-Chair of the Nikkei for Civil Rights and Redress of Los Angeles, explained that NCCR supported the Glendale monument and expressed support for the memorial to help educate others around issues of sex slavery.
9. Miho Kim Lee of the Japan Multicultural Relief Fund said she represents 20 organizations, some of which are located in Japan. She explained that her grandfather was forced to work in southern Japan and that as a person of Korean descent, she was not entitled to education in Japan.
10. Joe Tomsick read a statement by Dr. Rachel Pfeffer, who could not attend the meeting. Dr. Pfeffer emphasized "moral courage" and urged support for the memorial.

Dr. Murase suggested that the community could tie the comfort women issue to modern day slavery with a living memorial, a shelter for human trafficking survivors. Commissioner Soo thanked the public for sharing their comments on the matter and expressed support for the resolution. Commissioner Kirshner-Rodriguez stated that she supports the comfort women. President Andrea Shorter urged the audience to think broadly about the issue.

### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

*Action: To adjourn the meeting at 5:05 pm.*

*m/s/c (Soo/Shorter/Unanimous)*

Due to time limitations, the Executive Director's Report and General Public Comment were not taken up by the Commission.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. 554-5184  
Fax No. 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Emily Murase, PhD, Executive Director, Department on the Status of Women

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Committee Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee, Board of Supervisors

DATE: April 12, 2016

SUBJECT: HEARING MATTER INTRODUCED

---

The Board of Supervisors' Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee has received the following hearing request, introduced by Supervisor Tang on April 5, 2016:

**File No. 160337**

**Hearing on the Family Violence Council's 5th Comprehensive Report on family violence in San Francisco for FY2013-2014; and requesting the Department on the Status of Women to report.**

If you have any comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c:

Minouche Kandel, Department on the Status of Women  
Elizabeth Newman, Department on the Status of Women

# Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp  
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee.  
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [ ] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [ ] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [ ]
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on [ ]

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission       Youth Commission       Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission       Building Inspection Commission

**Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative**

**Sponsor(s):**


Tang

**Subject:**

Hearing on the Family Violence Council's 5th Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco (FY 2014)

**The text is listed below or attached:**

[Empty box for text listing]

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only: