

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Kimberly Ellis, Director, Department on the Status of Women

FROM: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Safety Committee, Board of Supervisors

DATE: August 4, 2021

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

---

The Board of Supervisors' Public Safety and Neighborhood Safety Committee has received the following hearing request, introduced by Supervisor Stefani on July 27, 2021:

**File No. 210894**

**Hearing on the Family Violence Council's 10th Comprehensive Report on family violence in San Francisco for Fiscal Year 2019-2020; and requesting the Department of 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: Offices of Chair Mar and Supervisor Stefani  
Carol Sacco, Department on the Status of Women  
Elizabeth Newman, Department on the Status of Women  
Elise Hansell, Department on the Status of Women



# Family Violence Council Report

JULY 01, 2019 – JUNE 30, 2020

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

## Acknowledgments

This report was written by:

Selma Osman, Public Policy Fellow, Department on the Status of Women

Elise Hansell, Policy and Grants Manager, Department on the Status of Women

This is the tenth report in a series of annual reports made possible through the Fellowship Program at the Department on the Status of Women. The report builds off of the work of previous fellows and department staff.

Editing assistance by:

Elizabeth Newman, Policy and Projects Director, Department on the Status of Women

The Family Violence Council Chairs are:

Katie Albright, Executive Director, Safe & Sound

Shawna Reeves, Director of Elder Abuse Prevention, Institute on Aging

Beverly Upton, Executive Director, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium

The Family Violence Council is administered by the Department on the Status of Women, under the guidance of Director Kimberly Ellis.

Visit <https://sfgov.org/dosw/family-violence-reports> to download a copy of this report and reports from previous years.

Issued May 2021. Updated July 2021.

© 2021 San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

## Message from the Family Violence Council Chairs



Katie Albright,  
Safe & Sound/San  
Francisco Child Abuse  
Prevention Council



Shawna Reeves,  
Institute on Aging



Beverly Upton,  
Domestic Violence  
Consortium

The 10th anniversary of the San Francisco Family Violence Council Report comes at an unprecedented time for family violence in San Francisco and across the country. As COVID-19 cases surged in March 2020, San Francisco was the first city to institute a shelter-in-place order. With movement limited and people confined to often crowded homes, significant concerns about an increase in family violence arose. Families were faced with immense stressors, including loss of jobs and income, food insecurity, barriers to accessing education, isolation, and lack of contact with support systems; adult, child, and elder victims were left confined with their abusers, unable to find privacy to make a call for help. Traditional sources of support and protection from relatives, friends, and neighbors to teachers, health professionals, therapists, and community workers were left with only limited contact. Many elders were, for the first time, left to rely on others to get their most basic needs met. Many adult, child, and elder victims had limited access to or understanding of technology and became increasingly isolated and depressed. While the challenges increased, the underlying conditions and structural inequities, have always existed. The combined global pandemic and economic collapse laid bare the facts that inequities related to social determinants of health are magnified during a crisis and that sheltering in place does not inflict equivalent hardship on all people. Throughout the pandemic, Asian and Pacific Islander older adults became the targets of hate crimes, homicides, and assaults. As in past years, the data for this year's report shows clear racial disparities across all three forms of family violence. While the San Francisco Family Violence Council and our members are working to understand what conclusions can be drawn from this year's data, we know that the effects of this year's tragedies are here for many years to come, and the need to address family violence has only grown.

We continue to be inspired by the enduring strength and resilience of the communities we work with, the public and private organizations that seek to prevent and respond to family violence, and the people who dedicate their lives to give the opportunity to live free from violence. With this drive to work towards a better future, we are excited to release the FY 2019-2020 Report of the San Francisco Family Violence Council. We are incredibly proud of the advances that we have made in the last year: including working with domestic violence shelter leadership to continue the availability of shelters to survivors and their children, while ensuring the health and safety of staff and meeting survivor's needs amidst the pandemic, the approval of the San Francisco Police Department General Order (DGO 6.09) and its training manual before the Police Commission, and the approval and distribution of Police Department Notice #20-11, an abbreviated version of the SFPD Elder Abuse Investigations Manual. In this report, you will learn about family violence in San Francisco, including the prevalence of abuse, the response from City agencies, demographics of victims and survivors, access to community-based services, and demographics of people using abuse. Based on these findings, the Family Violence Council has developed a set of five key recommendations aimed at ending child abuse, domestic

violence, and elder abuse in San Francisco. We look forward to continuing to build a community to address family violence and plan for recovery that will strengthen our long-term response to the severe impact that the pandemic, economic turmoil, and renewed focus on the effect systemic racism is having on families. We are grateful for your interest in this issue and the work of the Council and our partners.

## Table of Contents

TABLE OF FIGURES.....	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	10
Overall Key Findings .....	10
COVID Impact Key Findings .....	11
New Recommendations .....	11
Key Findings: Child Abuse .....	12
Key Findings: Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse .....	13
Key Findings: Domestic Violence .....	14
Achievements of the Family Violence Council .....	20
INTRODUCTION .....	22
Goals of the Report .....	22
San Francisco Family Violence Council .....	22
Structure of this report .....	23
Note on Language .....	23
Note on Disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System and Racial Injustice .....	23
Note on COVID-19.....	25
COVID-19 IMPACT .....	26
CHAPTER 1: CHILD ABUSE .....	30
Data Sources.....	32
Prevalence.....	32
System Response.....	35
Demographics of Victims .....	39
Services Available for Survivors .....	44
Perpetrators .....	46
Family Violence in San Francisco: FY 2019 – FY 2020	5

Services Available for Perpetrators.....	49
CHAPTER 2: ELDER AND DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE .....	50
Data Sources.....	52
Prevalence .....	52
System Response.....	56
Demographics of Victims .....	58
Services Available for Survivors .....	61
Perpetrators .....	62
Services Available for Perpetrators.....	64
CHAPTER 3: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	65
Data Sources.....	66
Prevalence .....	66
System Response.....	72
Demographics of Victims .....	77
Services Available for Survivors .....	81
Perpetrators .....	89
Services Available for Perpetrators.....	91
APPENDIX .....	94
Appendix A: List of Family Violence Council Members in FY 2020 .....	94
Appendix B: Services Available .....	94

## Table of Figures

FIGURE 1: NUMBER OF CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATIONS IN SAN FRANCISCO, FY 2010-FY 2020 .....	33
FIGURE 2: NUMBER OF CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATIONS BY ALLEGATION TYPE, FY 2019-FY 2020.....	33
FIGURE 3: CALLS TO 911 RELATED TO CHILD ABUSE BY CALL TYPE, FY 2020 .....	34
FIGURE 4: CHILDREN WITH MALTREATMENT REPORTS BY SCHOOL REPORTER TYPE AND SCHOOL YEAR, SY 2018-SY 2020 .....	35
FIGURE 5: PATHWAYS FOR SUBSTANTIATING CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATIONS .....	36
FIGURE 6: CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE INDICATORS PROJECT: SUBSTANTIATED CASES OF CHILD ABUSE IN SAN FRANCISCO, FY 2010-FY 2020.....	36
FIGURE 7: CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE INDICATORS PROJECT: SUBSTANTIATED CASES OF CHILD ABUSE PER 1,000 CHILDREN IN SAN FRANCISCO, CY 2009-CY 2019 .....	37
FIGURE 8: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO CHILD ABUSE INCIDENTS REPORTED, FY 2019 AND FY 2020.....	37
FIGURE 9: CASES OF CHILD ABUSE RECEIVED AND PROSECUTED, FY 2015-FY 2020 .....	38
FIGURE 10: TYPES OF CHILD ABUSE PROSECUTED, FY 2015-FY 2020.....	38
FIGURE 11: CHILD DEATH REVIEW TEAM: CHILD DEATHS IN SAN FRANCISCO, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	39
FIGURE 12: RACE/ETHNICITY OF CHILD IN SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION COMPARED TO THE SAN FRANCISCO POPULATION UNDER 20, FY 2020 .....	40
FIGURE 13: CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER: RACE/ETHNICITY OF CHILD VICTIMS COMPARED TO THE SAN FRANCISCO POPULATION UNDER 20, FY 2020.....	41
FIGURE 14: SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS BY TYPE AND GENDER OF CHILD, FY 2020 .....	42
FIGURE 15: CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER: GENDER OF CHILD VICTIMS, FY 2020 .....	42
FIGURE 16: CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER: TYPE OF ABUSE BASED ON INTERVIEW BY GENDER, FY 2020 (N=111) .....	43
FIGURE 17: AGE OF CHILDREN WITH ABUSE REFERRALS, FY 2020 .....	43
FIGURE 18: CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE INDICATORS PROJECT: NUMBER OF SUBSTANTIATED CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATIONS IN SAN FRANCISCO IN EVERY 1,000, BY AGE-GROUP, CY 2018-CY 2019 .....	44
FIGURE 19: CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER: AGE OF CHILD VICTIMS, FY 2019-FY 2020.....	44
FIGURE 20: SERVICES AVAILABLE FOR SURVIVORS OF CHILD ABUSE .....	45
FIGURE 21: NUMBER OF CLIENTS SERVED BY TYPE OF ABUSE, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	46
FIGURE 22: RACE/ETHNICITY OF CHILD ABUSE SUSPECTS COMPARED TO GENERAL SAN FRANCISCO POPULATION, FY 2020 .....	47
FIGURE 23: GENDER OF CHILD ABUSE SUSPECTS, FY 2020 .....	48
FIGURE 24: AGE OF CHILD ABUSE SUSPECTS, FY 2020 .....	48
FIGURE 25: ELDER AND DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE: REPORTS RECEIVED AND SUBSTANTIATED, FY 2015-FY 2020 .	53
FIGURE 26: ELDER ABUSE: REFERRALS AND SUBSTANTIATIONS, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	53
FIGURE 27: DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE: REFERRALS AND SUBSTANTIATIONS, FY 2019-FY 2020.....	53
FIGURE 28: SUBSTANTIATED REPORTS OF SELF-NEGLECT, FY 2019-FY 2020.....	54
FIGURE 29: TYPES OF ABUSE: ELDER ABUSE, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	54
FIGURE 30: TYPES OF ABUSE: DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE, FY 2019-FY 2020.....	54
FIGURE 31: 911 CALLS RELATING TO ELDER ABUSE, FY 2015-FY 2020 .....	55
FIGURE 32: CALLS TO 911 RELATING TO ELDER ABUSE BY CALL TYPE, FY 2018-FY 2020 .....	56
FIGURE 33: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO CASES REFERRED TO APS HOTLINE .....	57
FIGURE 34: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO ELDER PHYSICAL ABUSE CASES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	57
FIGURE 35: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO ELDER FINANCIAL ABUSE CASES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	57
FIGURE 36: RACE/ETHNICITY (WHERE KNOWN) OF SUBSTANTIATED CASES OF ABUSE BY OTHERS AND SELF NEGLECT, ELDER ABUSE AND DEPENDENT ADULT VICTIMS COMPARED TO SF POPULATION 65+, FY 2020....	59
FIGURE 37: GENDER OF SUBSTANTIATED CASES OF ABUSE BY OTHERS, ELDER ABUSE AND DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE VICTIMS, FY 2020 .....	60
FIGURE 38: NUMBER OF CASES, FY 2018-FY 2020.....	61
FIGURE 39: NUMBER OF CLIENTS AGED 65+ SERVED BY GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE FUNDED PROGRAMS, FY 2018-FY 2020 .....	61
FIGURE 40: RACE/ETHNICITY OF ELDER ABUSE SUSPECTS COMPARED TO GENERAL SF POPULATION, FY 2020 .....	62



FIGURE 41: GENDER OF ELDER ABUSE SUSPECTS, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	63
FIGURE 42: AGE OF ELDER ABUSE SUSPECTS, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	63
FIGURE 43: CASES OF ABUSE BY OTHERS, RELATIONSHIP TO PERPETRATOR, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	64
FIGURE 44: 911 CALLS RELATED TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, FY 2018-FY 2020 .....	67
FIGURE 45: TRANSLATION REQUESTS FOR INCOMING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CALLS, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	68
FIGURE 46: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INCIDENTS WHERE WEAPON WAS USED BY GENDER OF SUSPECT, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	68
FIGURE 47: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INCIDENTS WHERE WEAPON WAS USED BY GENDER OF VICTIM, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	69
FIGURE 48: SAN FRANCISCO HOMICIDES BY CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCE, CY 2019-CY 2020 .....	70
FIGURE 49: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FAMILY VIOLENCE HOMICIDE VICTIMS, CY 2019-CY 2020 .....	70
FIGURE 50: SUSPECTED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RELATED HOMICIDES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	71
FIGURE 51: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMICIDES WITH FEMALE VICTIMS, CY 1991-CY 2020 .....	71
FIGURE 52: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	72
FIGURE 53: INCIDENTS RESPONDED TO BY POLICE OFFICERS AND ARRESTS, FY 2015-FY 2020 .....	73
FIGURE 54: SYSTEM RESPONSE TO STALKING CASES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	73
FIGURE 55: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, AND ELDER ABUSE CASES RECEIVED AND PROSECUTIONS, FY 2015-FY 2020 .....	74
FIGURE 56: FILING STATISTICS FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, AND ELDER ABUSE BY ACTION TYPE FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	74
FIGURE 57: CASES TRIED FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, AND ELDER ABUSE, FY 2018-FY 2020 .....	75
FIGURE 58: CIVIL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER REQUESTS, FY 2018-FY 2020 .....	76
FIGURE 59: RACE/ETHNICITY OF VICTIM COMPARED TO GENERAL SF POPULATION, FY 2020 .....	77
FIGURE 60: GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE (GBV) GRANT-FUNDED PROGRAMS: LANGUAGES SPOKEN, FY 2020 .....	78
FIGURE 61: GENDER OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM, FY 2020 .....	79
FIGURE 62: GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE (GBV) GRANT-FUNDED PROGRAMS: GENDER OF CLIENT WHERE KNOWN, FY 2020 .....	79
FIGURE 63: AGE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	79
FIGURE 64: GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE (GBV) GRANT-FUNDED PROGRAMS: AGE OF CLIENT (WHERE KNOWN), FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	80
FIGURE 65: YOUTH RISK BEHAVIOR SURVEY: % OF STUDENTS WHO EXPERIENCED PHYSICAL DATING VIOLENCE, SY 2018-SY 2019 .....	80
FIGURE 66: YOUTH RISK BEHAVIOR SURVEY: % OF STUDENTS WHO EXPERIENCED SEXUAL DATING VIOLENCE, SY 2018-SY 2019 .....	81
FIGURE 67: COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS: SUMMARY REPORT, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	82
FIGURE 68: MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS, SHELTER REFERRALS, AND PROGRAM SEARCHES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	83
FIGURE 69: EMERGENCY SHELTER BED NIGHTS PROVIDED AND TURN AWAY RATES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	83
FIGURE 70: TRANSITIONAL SHELTER BED NIGHTS PROVIDED AND TURN AWAY RATES, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	84
FIGURE 71: HOURS OF COUNSELING AND CASE MANAGEMENT PROVIDED TO CLIENTS, FY 2017-FY 2020 .....	85
FIGURE 72: SURVIVOR RESTORATION PROGRAM: NEW AND ONGOING CLIENTS, FY 2015-FY 2020 .....	85
FIGURE 73: SURVIVOR RESTORATION PROGRAM: OUTCOMES, FY 2020 .....	86
FIGURE 74: OUTPATIENT PRIMARY CARE AND WOMEN'S CLINIC: CLIENTS EXPERIENCING INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE BY GENDER, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	88
FIGURE 75: TRAUMA RECOVERY CENTER: CLIENT STATISTICS BY TRAUMA TYPE, FY 2020 .....	88
FIGURE 76: RACE/ETHNICITY OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND STALKING SUSPECTS, FY 2020 .....	89
FIGURE 77: GENDER OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SUSPECTS, FY 2020 .....	90
FIGURE 78: GENDER OF DEFENDANTS BY CRIME TYPE, FY 2020 .....	90
FIGURE 79: AGE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SUSPECTS, FY 2020 .....	90
FIGURE 80: AGE OF DEFENDANTS BY CRIME TYPE, FY 2020 .....	91
FIGURE 81: PERSONS SUPERVISED BY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	91
FIGURE 82: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT REVOCATIONS AND NON-COMPLIANCE, FY 2019-FY 2020 .....	92
FIGURE 83: MANALIVE PROGRAM: INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING, FY 2020 .....	92

FIGURE 84: RESOLVE TO STOP THE VIOLENCE PROGRAM: PARTICIPANTS WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CHARGES BY RACE/ETHNICITY COMPARED TO GENERAL SAN FRANCISCO POPULATION, FY 2020 ..... 93

## Executive Summary

Violence impacts individuals at different stages of life. Child abuse, elder or dependent adult abuse, and domestic violence (also known as intimate partner violence or IPV) are all forms of family violence that have traumatizing and far-reaching effects on individuals, families, and entire communities. Family violence can include abuse that is physical, sexual, psychological, or economic, and is characterized by behaviors that are used to isolate, neglect, or exercise power and control over a person. In 2007, the Family Violence 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 to reduce family violence in San Francisco.

Each year, the San Francisco Family Violence Council and the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women issues a comprehensive report on family violence in San Francisco. The report presents data on the prevalence of abuse, the response from City agencies, utilization of community-based services, demographics of victims and survivors, and demographics of people using abuse. This report aims to track trends of family violence in San Francisco, identify gaps and needs in response and services, and inform policymaking and funding priorities for the City.

This report is the tenth Family Violence in San Francisco report and covers the period between July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 (fiscal year 2020). Data from more than 10 City public agencies and 27 community-based organizations has been included.

### Overall Key Findings

This report elevates the following findings across all three forms of family violence in San Francisco. Key findings for each form of abuse are summarized in pages that follow.

1. There are clear racial disparities across all three forms of family violence; reported family violence disproportionately impacts Black/African American and Latinx populations:
  - 4 out of 10 substantiated child abuse cases involved Black children and 1 in 3 involved Latinx children
  - 28% of dependent adult abuse victims were Black
  - More than half of domestic violence victims were Black or Latinx
2. Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse disproportionately affect women:
  - Women made up 70% of victims in domestic violence incidents responded to by police
  - 54% of elder abuse victims were women
3. Men remain the largest users of abuse in family violence cases:
  - 68% of perpetrators in child abuse and elder and dependent adult abuse cases were men
  - 78% of perpetrators of domestic violence were men
4. There remains a significant need for shelter for survivors of family violence in San Francisco:
  - 79% clients were turned away from emergency shelter in FY 2020

## COVID Impact Key Findings

The City and County of San Francisco, like communities across the world, was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis that began in late 2019. Due to this global pandemic, there were several ways in which the work of the Family Violence Council and other organizations were affected. This report elevates the following findings related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on family violence in San Francisco. A full description of COVID-19 impact on family violence in San Francisco can be found in the full report.

1. It is difficult to point to the pandemic's effect on the prevalence of family violence through the quantitative data collected in this report. More quantitative data is needed to examine the impact of the pandemic on prevalence of family violence in the city.
2. Qualitative reporting from community-based organizations showed feelings of decreased safety for survivors after the shelter-in-place order took effect.
3. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of jury trials decreased sharply after early March 2020, and for many months no jury trials were conducted at all in San Francisco county.
4. Concerns were raised over the potential for under reporting of family violence due to decreased interaction with mandated reporters as a result of the pandemic.
5. City departments and community-based organizations adapted to the changing needs of survivors during the pandemic and pivoted their services to address these needs.

## New Recommendations

Below are new recommendations that the Family Violence Council has prioritized for the upcoming year. The full list of five recommendations is available in the report.

1. Promote access to basic needs and integrate family violence prevention in disaster planning and recovery plans.
2. Increase access to training and expand expertise of frontline staff to provide a trauma-informed response to survivors of family violence.
3. Improve San Francisco's emergency response to vulnerable older adults with dementia and other conditions.
4. Transform the City's response to child welfare.
5. Prevent the intergenerational transmission of violence.

## Key Findings: Child Abuse

### Prevalence

**Child abuse allegations:** Family and Children’s Services reported **5,230** child abuse cases.

**911 Calls:** There were **411** child abuse related calls to 911.

**Mandated reporting:** There were **1788** reports made by mandated reporters in schools during SY 2020.

**Substantiated cases:** Family and Children’s Services substantiated **10%** of cases (533 of 5,230 total cases).

### System Response

**Arrests:** **253** arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department.

**Prosecutions:** The District Attorney’s Office prosecuted **33** cases out of 52 cases received, the largest share being cases involving child sexual abuse materials (**58%**).

**Convictions:** **Two** cases resulted in a conviction through trial on at least one count.

### Demographics of Victims

**Race/ethnicity:** Latinx and Black/African American children were overrepresented among victims with substantiated allegations, (**39%** and **32%**, respectively).

**Gender:** Boys experienced child abuse at a higher rate (**52%**) than girls (**48%**). Boys more frequently experienced general neglect, physical abuse, and emotional abuse. Girls more frequently experienced sexual abuse, severe neglect, and/or exploitation.

### Perpetrators

**Gender:** Men represented the majority of child abuse suspects (**68%**).

**Relationship to victim:** **91%** of perpetrators were parents or stepparents of the victim.

### Key Data Points (FY 2020)

**533**

of 5,230 child abuse cases substantiated

**411**

911 calls related to child abuse

**253**

arrests related to child abuse

**52**

cases received by the District Attorney

**32%**

of child abuse victims were Black/African American

**91%**

of perpetrators were parents or stepparents of the victim

## Key Findings: Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse

### Prevalence

**Reports of elder and dependent adult abuse:** 54% of reports (3,911 of 7,204) were substantiated.

**Self-neglect cases:** There were a total of **2,472** substantiated elder abuse self-neglect cases.

**911 Calls:** There were **162** elder abuse related calls to 911.

### Key Data Points (FY 2020)

**7,204**

elder abuse cases  
reported

### System Response

**System response to elder physical abuse cases:** **448** elder abuse incidents were reported to the Police Department.

**System response to elder financial abuse cases:** **38** elder financial abuse incidents were reported to the Police Department.

**Arrests:** **188** arrests were made in elder physical abuse cases.

**54%**

of 7,204 cases  
substantiated

**2,472**

substantiated self-  
neglect cases

### Demographics of Victims

**Race/ethnicity:** The Black/African American community was overrepresented among victims of abuse by others, representing **16%** of elder abuse victims and **28%** of dependent adult abuse victims.

**Gender:** Women comprised a slightly larger share of total victims of elder abuse (**54%**).

**188**

arrests made  
in elder physical  
abuse cases

**54%**

of total elder abuse  
victims were women

### Perpetrators

**Gender:** Men represented **68%** of total elder abuse suspects.

**Relationship to victim:** **86%** of victims knew the perpetrator. **43%** of victims were abused by a family member.

**86%**

of elder abuse victims  
knew the perpetrator

## Key Findings: Domestic Violence

### Prevalence

**911 Calls:** More than half of the **7,241** domestic violence related 911 calls concerned a fight or dispute where no weapons were used.

**Weapons used:** **2,827** domestic violence incidents reported involved a weapon. The Sheriff's Department restrained party owned firearms in 17 cases.

**Homicides:** **Two** domestic violence related homicides and one family violence related homicide were reported in CY 2020.

### System Response

**Incidents Reported:** **3,379** incidents were responded to the Police Department.

**Prosecutions:** 543 of 1,587 total cases received by the District Attorney's Office (**34%**) were prosecuted.

**Convictions:** **7 of 8** cases resulted in a conviction by trial.

**Restraining Orders:** The Family Law Division of the San Francisco Superior Court received **825** requests for domestic violence restraining orders and granted **74%** of requests (292).

### Demographics of Victims

**Race/ethnicity:** The Black/African American and Latinx communities were overrepresented among victims (**29%** and **27%**, respectively).

**Languages Spoken:** **3,689 of 14,501** individuals served by the Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Intervention Grants Program (**25%**) spoke a language other than English.

**Gender:** Female victims made up **70%** of Police incidents.

**Age:** Victims between the ages of 18 and 39 years of age represented **54%** of Police incidents.

### Perpetrators

**Gender:** Men represented **78%** of suspects.

**Age:** **60%** of suspects and defendants are under the age of 40.

### Key Data Points (FY 2020)

**14,501**

individuals served by  
GBV grant-funded  
programs

**7,241**

domestic violence  
related calls to 911

**3,379**

incidents responded  
to by police

**1,587**

cases received by the  
District Attorney

**2**

domestic violence  
related homicides

**78%**

of domestic violence  
suspects were male

# Family Violence Council Recommendations

For the list of recommendations and implementation plans, please see the Family Violence in San Francisco, FY 2020 Report.



## Recommendation 1:

Promote access to basic needs and integrate family violence prevention in disaster planning and recovery.

trauma informed

anti-racism and cultural humility

## Recommendation 2:

Increase Access to Training for Frontline Staff.

## Recommendation 3:


Improve Emergency Response to Vulnerable Older Adults.

## Recommendation 4:

Transform Response to Child Welfare.

## Recommendation 5:

Prevent the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence.





Recommendation	1. Supporting Families to Rebuild a Healthy San Francisco.
Description	<p>To prevent family violence, the Family Violence Council must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collectively acknowledge the role of racism and systemic oppression in contributing to economic insecurity and family violence disproportionately impacting women and girls of color in San Francisco.</li> <li>• Work to address the intersections of interpersonal and structural violence by centering the needs of survivors who are BIPOC.</li> <li>• Increase collaboration across departments and agencies to integrate family violence prevention in economic recovery efforts and disaster response planning.</li> </ul>
Areas of Implementation	<p>Promote Access to Basic Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assign a representative from the Family Violence Council to the Universal Basic Income Taskforce, with the goal of inclusion of family violence survivors in the UBI priority populations.</li> <li>• Ensure that city rental relief extends to families that are subtenants.</li> <li>• Extend SFUSD’s Free Meals Program through 2022.</li> <li>• Extend relief funding for families that do not qualify for local, state, or federal assistance due to immigration or other status through 2022.</li> <li>• Increase City’s investment in shelter and housing resources for survivors of gender-based violence.</li> <li>• Increase awareness of financial abuse as a form of community violence perpetrated against low-income BIPOC elders.</li> <li>• Continue to provide broadband access, technology, and other educational supports to address learning loss issues, exacerbated by the pandemic.</li> <li>• Provide smartphones and unlimited smartphone data and text/talk plans for domestic violence victims and sex trafficking survivors.</li> </ul> <p>Integrate Family Violence Prevention in Disaster Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support City Departments that are members of the Family Violence Council to create a response plan to address and prevent family violence in disaster planning. Violence prevention plans might include public education and awareness, emergency data snapshots of both quantitative and qualitative data, plans to change how services are provided in response to disasters and policy recommendations based on emerging trends.</li> </ul>
Lead Agencies	Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Department of Public Health, Department on the Status of Women, SF Domestic Violence Consortium, Institute on Aging, Mayor’s Office, Safe & Sound, San Francisco Unified School District

Recommendation	2. Increase Access to Training and Expand Expertise of Frontline Staff to Provide a Trauma-informed Response to Survivors of Family Violence.
Description	Convene a cross-disciplinary committee to map existing training resources and identify gaps for county-wide trainings on all forms of family violence. Develop a directory of the training community-based organizations can offer for distribution amongst Family Violence Council members. Identify funding to support community-based organizations to conduct trainings for member agencies and frontline staff to provide a trauma-informed response to survivors of family violence.
Areas of Implementation	<p>Conduct child abuse, domestic violence, and elder/ dependent adult abuse trainings led by community-based organizations for frontline city workers who respond to family violence. Community based agencies can offer a vital perspective on best practices for working with survivors, dynamics of abuse, cultural humility, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Francisco Police Department: train SFPD patrol officers on new Department General Order 6.09 and lethality assessment; provide SFPD with training on recognition and reporting of young people being commercially sexually exploited.</li> <li>• Superior Court: train Judges appointed to Family Court on family violence issues.</li> <li>• General Mandated Reporters, Child Welfare Protective Services Workers, Police Officers: provide training on general neglect, cultural humility &amp; equity, anti-bias, anti-racism, and harm reduction/substance use disorders.</li> </ul>
Lead Agencies	San Francisco Police Department, District Attorney’s Office, Superior Court, Department on the Status of Women, SF Domestic Violence Consortium, Safe & Sound, Human Services Agency, Institute on Aging, San Francisco Unified School District

Recommendation	3. Improve San Francisco’s Emergency Response to Vulnerable Older Adults with Dementia and Other Conditions.
Description	Develop plans for the creation of a Geriatric Emergency Response Unit.
Areas of Implementation	<p>Establish a 24-7 Geriatric EMS (GEMS) unit for San Francisco that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help bridge the gaps in emergency response care for vulnerable and isolated older adults while not replacing existing services.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide coordinated services for elders experiencing acute and ongoing medical and/or cognitive crises, so that they can live safely in the community.</li> </ul> <p>Partner with San Francisco’s Elder Abuse Forensic Center and the soon-to-be-created High Risk Self Neglect MDT.</p>
Lead Agencies	San Francisco Fire Department Community Paramedicine, UCSF, Department of Public Health, Adult Protective Services, Institute on Aging/San Francisco Elder Abuse Forensic Center

Recommendation	<b>4. Transform the City’s Response to Child Welfare.</b>
Description	Work with Family and Children’s Services (FCS) to address the overrepresentation of BIPOC families in child welfare and to increase the focus on prevention.
Areas of Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and support use of the Racial Equity Feedback Loop at the child welfare hotline to better understand which families are screened in and screened out.</li> <li>Gather discrete and disaggregated data on children 0-1 that child welfare removes from their families to develop a better understanding of the disproportionate removal of BIPOC children, age 0-1, and removal in cases where birth parent has substance use disorder.</li> <li>Join state and national efforts to redefine neglect, due to poverty only, so that there will no longer be FCS involvement due to poverty only.</li> <li>Explore training opportunities and collaboration with domestic violence partners to understand policies regarding ‘failure to protect’ and domestic violence.</li> <li>Explore best practices in cross-reporting between child welfare and law enforcement.</li> <li>Join national efforts to inform parents of their rights before FCS investigations begin.</li> </ul>
Lead Agencies	Human Services Agency, Safe & Sound, Department on the Status of Women

Recommendation	<b>5. Prevent the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence.</b>
Description	Expand on-site advocacy services for people experiencing, or at risk of experiencing, interpersonal violence at San Francisco General Hospital.

<p>Areas of Implementation</p>	<p>ARISE (Aspire to Re-Imagine Safety and Equity) is a program designed to build multi-sector public health and healthcare (SFDPH/SFHN)-university (UCSF)-community partnerships to prevent and mitigate trauma including interpersonal violence and promote healing, health equity and social justice. The clinical components of ARISE are all currently based in the SFHN primary care and women’s clinics. ARISE co-located a domestic violence advocate from La Casa de las Madres (the ARISE IPV Advocate) on the San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) campus to respond immediately to patients from five outpatient clinics who disclose relationship stress or interpersonal violence. The ARISE IPV Advocate provides patients with on-site education, emotional support, safety planning, and expedited referrals to support groups and services, counseling, legal assistance, and shelter.</p> <p>This expansion of the ARISE IPV Advocacy to all pregnant persons seeking care at SFGH will improve the capacity of ARISE to prevent the intergenerational transmission of violence.</p>
<p>Lead Agencies</p>	<p>UCSF, Department of Public Health, La Casa de las Madres</p>

## Achievements of the Family Violence Council

The Family Violence Council completed the following recommendations in FY 2020. It will be important to codify these recommendations to ensure sustainability moving forward. Plans for doing so are outlined below. To monitor the progress of all recommendations, the Family Violence Council will ask for routine updates from agencies directly involved with implementation, including the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department, and the San Francisco Adult Probation Department.

RECOMMENDATION	UPDATE
<p><b>Request emergency funding for agencies engaged in prevention of and response to child abuse, domestic violence, and elder abuse.</b></p>	<p>In partnership with the California Family Resource Association (CFRA), the San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Council advocated for and secured \$3 million in State COVID-19 relief for vulnerable families, \$169,000 of which went to San Francisco Family Resource Centers (FRCs) to support over 4,000 families with additional concrete needs. In December 2020, the FRC Alliance and First 5 worked with the Office of Early Care and Education and members of the Early Childhood Education community to obtain the release of \$3 million to support FRC COVID-19 relief efforts.</p>
<p><b>Increase awareness around family violence during COVID-19.</b></p> <p><b>Finalize Domestic Violence Manual for Police Department</b></p>	<p>The Child Abuse Prevention Council, the School Health Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and Family and Children’s Services adapted a resource for educators to support them in finding ways to talk with children, when not in-person, about concerns they might have for their health and safety and in identifying issues and indicators that might rise to the level of mandating a child abuse report.</p> <p>The Family Violence Council worked in collaboration with the Mayor’s Office on creating 311 emergency alerts, holding a series of townhalls on the subject.</p> <p>The Police commission approved DGO 6.09 in January 2021.</p>
<p><b>Create death review teams for domestic violence and elder abuse deaths and identify best practices and share lessons between these teams and the Child Death Review Team.</b></p>	<p>In 2019, the Department on the Status of Women and the District Attorney’s Office held a series of planning meetings with member agencies of the Domestic Violence Death Review Team. The Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice provided technical assistance to this effort through the national Sentinel Event Initiative. The first case is currently under review, recommendations will be shared with the Council in 2021.</p> <p>Child Death Review Team has expanded the age range of cases it reviews from 0-25 years. This allows the Team to develop a better understanding of experiences and</p>

	<p>violence and health risks of transitional age youth, particularly related to drug usage and community violence.</p>
<p><b>Support educators on screening for family violence and mandated reporting.</b></p>	<p>The Community Education team at Safe &amp; Sound worked with SFUSD to establish a supportive system and protocols in the situation where a student discloses sexual assault or other violence during a virtual safety lesson.</p>
<p><b>Create a citywide Child Abuse Prevention Council focused on child abuse prevention to reduce substantiated allegations of child maltreatment for all race/ethnicities to 3.0 per 1,000 children by 2023.</b></p>	<p>Over the past several months, SFCTF has met with and researched a variety of programs and initiatives to better understand gaps in services in the city and structures and policies that relate to the disproportionate impact of child welfare involvement on Black and Brown families. A variety of stakeholders provided input to inform an initial set of recommendations the SFCTF provided to the Mayor.</p>

## Introduction

### Goals of the Report

This comprehensive report, compiled by the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women and approved by the San Francisco Family Violence Council, includes data from more than 10 City public agencies and 27 community-based organizations.

The report aims to:



Fulfill one of the Council's key priorities of tracking and analyzing of the levels of family violence in San Francisco and year-to-year trends;



Provide qualitative and quantitative data on family violence in San Francisco, including information on types of abuse; which groups may be more vulnerable to violence; support available to survivors, suspects, and known perpetrators following abuse; and the impact of violence on our community;



Present San Francisco's successes in preventing family violence, including strategies for building stronger families, educating communities, and reducing risk factors; and



Inform policy making and funding decisions by detailing where survivors of family violence access support and protection, and the extent to which providers meet survivors' needs and hold perpetrators accountable.

### San Francisco Family Violence Council

In 2007, San Francisco became the first county in California to broaden the scope of its Attorney General-mandated Domestic Violence Council to include child abuse and elder abuse along with domestic violence. The Council was originally 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 to reduce family violence in San Francisco.

San Francisco recognizes the importance of providing a broad range of access points for survivors of abuse. As of 2020, 26 agencies are official members of the Family Violence Council (See Appendix A for a list of all member agencies). The Council is chaired by three community-based experts in the different forms of family violence:

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

The Family Violence Council meets four times a year, while its committees meet more frequently.

## Structure of this report

The report is structured in three chapters, each focusing on a different form of family violence. In FY 2019, the *Family Violence in San Francisco Report* covered elder abuse first, then domestic violence, then child abuse. This year's report will begin with child abuse; next year's report will begin with domestic violence. The placement order of each form of abuse is not intended to attribute importance. Neither is the length of the chapter. There is more data available for domestic violence and child abuse than for elder abuse, for example, as elder abuse has, historically, been under-recognized. This report covers one fiscal year, from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (FY 2020).

## Note on Language

Agencies that contributed data to this report use different language to describe those who have experienced or perpetrated abuse. We recognize that language is important, and that each person affected by abuse has the right to identify as they see fit. However, for the purposes of this report, we will refer to those individuals who have experienced abuse by the most appropriate word for the context. For example, when discussing data from the police or District Attorney, the report uses the word "victims," as this is the term the legal system uses. When discussing data from community-based organizations, the report uses "clients" or "survivors."

In addition, for the purposes of this report, we refer to individuals who have been convicted of committing a crime of battery or abuse as the "perpetrator," which is the term that the legal system uses. We also refer to individuals who establish a pattern of power and control over another as "a person who uses/is using abuse." We recognize the need and importance to shift to person-first language.

It is also important to note the difference between terms like "case," "incidents," and "violations," and individual people, particularly when it comes to the criminal justice system. One individual may be involved in several cases, or have committed several violations of probation, for example. Similarly, one survivor may have experienced several "incidents." The report endeavors to make clear when the data refers to individual people, and when it does not.

Lastly, the way we collect Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) data is consistent with guidance from the San Francisco Office of Transgender Initiatives and Department of Human Resources given in Executive Directive 18-03 (issued October 25, 2018 by Mayor London Breed) and the Gender Inclusion Policy for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming City Employees. Through these policies, the City and County of San Francisco has made a commitment to move towards inclusive administrative forms and applications to lift up all identities, allowing people to more broadly choose how they self-identify when demographic information is collected.

## Note on Disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System and Racial Injustice

When reviewing data about perpetrators of family violence, it is important to consider the increased likelihood of perpetrators of color encountering the criminal justice system. A report by the W. Haywood Burns Institute found that, in 2015, there were a disproportionate number of Black adults represented at every stage of the criminal justice process in San Francisco. Despite making up just 6% of the adult population here, Black adults represent 40% of people arrested, 44% of people booked in County Jail, and 40% of people convicted. When looking at the relative likelihood of system involvement, Black adults are 7.1 times more likely as White adults to be arrested, 11 times as likely to be booked into



County Jail, and 10.3 times as likely to be convicted of a crime in San Francisco.<sup>1</sup> Additional independent research on cases processed by the San Francisco District Attorney (DA) concluded that there were substantial racial and ethnic disparities in criminal justice outcomes that tend to disfavor defendants of color, and Black people in particular.<sup>2</sup> Black people fared worse than White people across all outcomes in the research, including being less likely to have their cases dropped or dismissed.<sup>3</sup> However, the report also concluded that: “[n]early all of the racial disparities in case disposition outcomes can be attributed to the differences in case characteristics that are determined prior to a case being presented to the San Francisco District Attorney.” One way in which differences in case characteristics can be determined prior to the case being presented to the DA is through policing. The Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office of the U.S. Department of Justice published an Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) in 2016. The assessment found racial or ethnic disparities across policing practices in San Francisco, particularly in traffic stops, post-stop searches, warnings, citations, arrests, contraband discovery, and use of deadly force against African Americans. African American drivers in San Francisco were 24% more likely to be stopped compared to their representation in the San Francisco driving population and 9% more likely to be stopped compared to their representation among traffic violators. African American and Hispanic drivers were disproportionately searched and arrested following a stop compared to White drivers, even though they were less likely to be found with contraband than White drivers. The assessment also found numerous indicators of implicit and institutionalized bias against minority groups in the SFPD. The assessment concluded that SFPD general orders were outdated and did not reflect current practices surrounding biased policing, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.<sup>4</sup> In June 2020, the Public Policy Institute of California published a report on Proposition 47’s impacts on racial disparity in the criminal justice system. Proposition 47 reclassified various offenses, including drug and property offenses, from felonies to misdemeanors. The study found a reduction in pretrial detention and racial disparities in criminal justice outcomes across California as a result of the proposition, including a 5.9% reduction in the African American-White arrest rate gap.<sup>5</sup> However, racial disparities are still persistent and widespread. Racial disparities in the criminal justice system also lead to racial health inequalities and inequalities in experience of family violence.<sup>6</sup> Incarceration harms the mental and physical health of incarcerated individuals and their families. Community deterioration, mental illness, discrimination, oppression, and experiencing and witnessing violence are risk factors associated with increased violence. Other risk factors that increase the prevalence of violence include poverty, poor housing, illiteracy, and alcohol and drugs. This in turn has effects on families and communities, as history of violence in family and community leads to increased child maltreatment.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The W. Haywood Burns Institute for Justice Fairness and Equity, *San Francisco Justice Reinvestment Initiative: Racial and Ethnic Disparities Analysis*, pg.4, 2016. [https://burnsinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/SF-JRI\\_-\\_compressed.pdf](https://burnsinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/SF-JRI_-_compressed.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> MacDonald, J. and Raphael, S., *An Analysis of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Case Dispositions and Sentencing Outcomes for Criminal Cases Presented to and Processed by the Office of the San Francisco District Attorney*, pg. 136, 2017. <https://www.issuelab.org/resources/30712/30712.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pg.3

<sup>4</sup> Collaborative Reform Initiative, Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *An Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department*, 2016. [http://sfpd.prod.acquia-sites.com/sites/default/files/2018-11/DOJ\\_COPS%20CRI\\_SFPD%20OCT%202016%20Assessment.pdf](http://sfpd.prod.acquia-sites.com/sites/default/files/2018-11/DOJ_COPS%20CRI_SFPD%20OCT%202016%20Assessment.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Lofstrom, M., Martin, B., and Raphael, S., *Proposition 47’s Impact on Racial Disparity in Criminal Justice Outcomes*, 2020. <https://www.ppic.org/publication/proposition-47s-impact-on-racial-disparity-in-criminal-justice-outcomes/>

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership, *Community Health Needs Assessment, I2019*. [https://www.sfdph.org/dph/hc/HCAgen/2019/May%2021/CHNA\\_2019\\_Report\\_051719.pdf](https://www.sfdph.org/dph/hc/HCAgen/2019/May%2021/CHNA_2019_Report_051719.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

The City and County of San Francisco created the Office of Racial Equity (ORE) in Ordinance No 188-19 in July 2019 in response to growing racial disparities in the city. ORE was created to address the history of structural and institutional racism present in delivery of City services to the public and in the City's internal practices and systems. ORE created a citywide racial equity framework which directs Departments of the City and County of San Francisco to develop and implement mandated Racial Equity Action Plans. The legislation also required that City departments designate employees as racial equity leaders, acting as liaisons to ORE. The Department on the Status of Women, which staffs the Family Violence Council, released their Racial Equity Action Plan in December 2020. Examples of Department goals outlined in the Action Plan include expanding the ability for Commission members to hear from diverse voices from a place of importance, implemented through the Commission on the Status of Women having a seat on the Family Violence Council. The Department's Action Plan named the Family Violence Report as a means to identify racial inequalities amongst survivors of family violence and identified the Family Violence Council as working to help identify racial inequalities in access to services and existing policies and leading to reforms, new policies, and approaches.

In June 2020, the Commission on the Status of Women released a Statement on Racial Injustice recommitting the Commission and the Department to take action against racial injustice. Alongside the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on Black and Brown communities, "the disease of racial injustice is also present, and most despairingly manifested in the recent executions of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, Tony McDade, and George Floyd."<sup>8</sup> The Commission and Department stand "in solidarity with those who feel unsafe, targeted, unseen, and unheard,"<sup>9</sup> and urgently commit to fighting discrimination in all forms through anti-racist action. We have a lot of work to do.

### Note on COVID-19

The City and County of San Francisco, like communities across the world, was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis that began in late 2019. Due to this global pandemic, there were several ways in which the work of the Family Violence Council and other organizations were affected. It is also important to note that data this year and in future years around the prevalence of family violence in San Francisco may be influenced by lower levels of reporting and challenges around providing services to survivors in San Francisco under the shelter-in-place order that began in March 2020.

---

<sup>8</sup> Zwart, B., *Statement from San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women President Breanna Zwart on Racial Injustice*, 2020.

[https://sfgov.org/dosw/sites/default/files/SF%20COSW%20President%20Zwart%20Statement%20on%20Racial%20Injustice\\_06%2002%202020.pdf](https://sfgov.org/dosw/sites/default/files/SF%20COSW%20President%20Zwart%20Statement%20on%20Racial%20Injustice_06%2002%202020.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

## COVID-19 Impact

The City and County of San Francisco, like communities across the world, was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis that began in late 2019. Due to this global pandemic, there were several ways in which the work of the Family Violence Council and other organizations were affected. This section analyzes the potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on family violence in San Francisco. Please refer to the note on COVID-19 in the introduction. The following shows the impacts of the pandemic on prevalence of, system response to, service provision to survivors of, and effects on survivors of family violence in San Francisco.

### Prevalence

It is difficult to point to the pandemic's effect on the prevalence of family violence through the quantitative data collected in this report. The majority of the data for this report is collected annually, and the shelter-in-place order in California only took effect in March 2020, impacting the last four months of FY 2020. An exploration conducted by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) on 911 calls related to domestic violence provides a start at quantitatively analyzing the impact of the pandemic on family violence in the City. Quarterly qualitative data from the Gender-Based Violence (GBV) prevention and intervention grants program also show the impact of the pandemic on prevalence of family violence in San Francisco.



**4.79%**

increase in 911 calls  
related to domestic  
violence in March-  
May 2020

The San Francisco Police Department undertook an exploration of 911 call data to examine the effect of the pandemic on domestic violence trends in San Francisco. The exploration found that there was an additional increase in domestic violence related 911 calls received above a regular seasonal increase at the start of the pandemic, between March and May of 2020. Domestic violence related 911 calls in San Francisco increased 4.79% from March to May 2020 compared to the same months in 2019. This increase is inclusive of seasonal changes, so it is difficult to pinpoint the exact effects of the pandemic on this increase. The exploration also found that domestic violence related 911 calls for service at new locations in San Francisco increased from March to May 2020 by 4.79% compared to the same months in 2019. However, the exploration found that calls for service

declined at new and repeat locations in San Francisco overall by 4.84% from January to December 2020 compared to 2019. The increase in calls from March to May 2020 could also be attributed to additional outreach efforts made by the SFPD and Department of Emergency Management during the same period, described below.

The SFPD's Special Victims Unit identified and reached out to survivors of domestic violence in May and June of 2020 to help mitigate the potential impacts of staying at home on survivors. The Unit reached out to a total of 314 survivors who were at risk of being revictimized and provided referrals to victim support services to 66 survivors. The Department of Emergency management began offering an option to text 911 for help in April 2020, to try and support survivors who are unable to speak on the phone.



Many GBV partner agencies qualitatively reported decreased safety for survivors due to the pandemic and shelter-in-place. W.O.M.A.N., Inc. reported an increase in calls from friends and family members in the earlier weeks of the shelter in place, saying “Many callers were concerned about their loved ones and wanted WOMAN Inc. to intervene or find a way to get their loved one out of the abusive situation.” The decreased safety is attributed to sheltering-in-place with users of abuse, the release of users of abuse shortly after arrest, and increased releases from jails and prisons.



**166%**

increase in calls to  
CROC intake line  
between April and  
June 2020

In addition to feelings of decreased safety for survivors, data from GBV partner agencies has shown an increase in prevalence of family violence, and more specifically, domestic violence after the shelter-in-place order took effect. The Justice and Diversity Center, Domestic Violence Legal Service Program, reported “a troubling trend of rising violence in homes” reflected in data from hotlines and service providers. Asian Women’s Shelter observed calls with “more intensive situations” in the final quarter of FY 2020. La Casa de Las Madres reported an increase in volume of texts on their emergency text line since the beginning of the shelter-in-place order. W.O.M.A.N., Inc. reported a sharp increase in calls to their Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC) from April to June 2020. The CROC intake line received 89 calls in April 2020, 141 in May 2020, and 192 in June 2020. This represents a 116% increase in number of calls to the CROC intake line between April and June 2020.

Increases in requests for restraining orders were also observed by the Riley Center of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco. More clients were observed calling for restraining order assistance and less for domestic violence shelter.

### **System Response**

The pandemic has also impacted system responses to family violence cases. Due to the COVID-9 pandemic, the number of jury trials decreased sharply after early March 2020, and for many months no jury trials were conducted at all in San Francisco county. This decrease in jury trials is not unique to domestic violence cases but applies to all types of criminal and civil jury trials statewide. The impacts can be seen in Figure 62, showing a 78% decrease in cases resolved through jury trial for domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuse.

Additionally, concerns were raised over the potential for decreased reporting of family violence due to the pandemic. The Domestic Violence and Child Abuse/Sex Assault (CASA) teams of the District Attorney’s (DA) Office do “not believe that domestic violence or child abuse incidents have decreased in occurrence, but that incidents presented to our office can be attributed to the City’s shelter in place due to COVID-19.” Specifically, “child abuse cases have also most likely decreased because of far less interaction with mandated reporters,” such as public schools being closed after the shelter-in-place order. Decreased number of incidents presented to the DA’s Office is therefore potentially caused by a decrease in cases reported and presented to law enforcement.



**9%**

decrease in child-serving professionals trained as mandated reporters

Alongside concerns over decreased interaction with mandated reporters and potential for reporting of family violence was also a decrease in number of mandated reporter trainings in FY 2020 compared to FY 2019. In FY 2019, Safe & Sound conducted in-person mandated reporter trainings for 1,699 child-serving professionals to recognize and report child abuse. In FY 2020, 1,543 child-serving professionals attended the trainings, representing a 9% decrease in number of child-serving professionals trained compared to FY 2019. In FY 2020, in-person mandated reporter trainings were conducted through March 15, 2020. Following that date, mandated reporter trainings were shifted to a virtual format. Of the trainings in FY 2020, 1,348 were conducted in-person, and 195 were conducted virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Safety lessons were paused in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic and did not resume until the fall of 2020.

### Service Provision

Service providers to survivors of family violence have also been impacted by the pandemic. GBV partner agencies reported additional difficulties in provision of services due to the pandemic and sheltering-in-place. GBV partners also reported difficulties in procuring volunteers, increased need for technical assistance, and difficulties with data reporting due to the pandemic. Despite this, many services were changed or added to respond to the pandemic and continue to meet the needs of survivors.



**76%**

increase in volunteer hours at W.O.M.A.N., Inc.

Asian Women’s Shelter, Justice and Diversity Center, and SF Women Against Rape all reported difficulties with engaging and recruiting volunteers during the pandemic. However, volunteers were able to engage in new online programs, such as community webinars and online training programs. W.O.M.A.N, Inc. saw an increase in crisis line volunteer support in FY 2020 compared to FY 2019 due to the increased availability of volunteers working from home or unable to work due to the pandemic. In FY 2020, volunteers provided 8,342 hours of support, almost double the 4,743 hours of support provided by volunteers to W.O.M.A.N., Inc. in FY 2019.

The pandemic and shelter-in-place order increased the need for technical assistance for service providers due to the transition of many services to new online formats. Asian Women’s Shelter, Bay Area Legal Aid, the Justice & Diversity Center, the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic, and W.O.M.A.N., Inc. all observed increased need for technical support. Bay Area Legal Aid and the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic observed difficulties in service provision due to new online formats and increased hours in supporting clients through these new processes, resulting in an increase in number of hours of support provided to clients. W.O.M.A.N., Inc. reported additional needs to for technical assistance to help staff working remotely. SF Women Against Rape did not have the capacity to enter client data remotely at the start of the shelter-in-place order until July 2020. This affected their ability to report data during that time period.

Service providers increased outreach to survivors during the pandemic. This is reflected quantitatively and qualitatively. There was a large number of searches to the Domestic Violence Information and Referral Center (DVIRC) in the fourth quarter of FY 2020, showing that organizations are accessing the



**131%**

increase in total searches to DVIRC

online platform more so during the pandemic. Figure 73 provides a breakdown of DVIRC member organizations, shelter referrals, and program searches. Between FY 2019 and FY 2020, there was a 131% increase in total searches and a 114% increase in domestic violence shelter referrals. Community-based organizations also observed an increase in number of hours spent on providing counseling, casework, and advocacy to survivors. Figure 76 shows the number of hours of counseling, including individual and group counseling, and hours of case management provided. The number of hours of counseling and case management have increased to 24,603 hours of case management and 11,760 hours of counseling in FY 2020 from 11,918 hours of case management and 8,383 hours of counseling in FY 2019.

Service providers also qualitatively reported increased outreach to survivors during the pandemic. W.OM.A.N., Inc. created special safety planning place for survivors sheltering in place with a partner who uses abuse and created a resource page that has specific readings and options for friends and family to learn more about ways they can support their loved ones. Among other efforts, including sending care packages to survivors, Asian Women’s Shelter produced a “COVID Survival” webinar for specific communities covering family law, immigration law and social service needs emerging from the pandemic. Service providers have adapted in numerous other ways to the shifting needs to survivors during the pandemic, including shifting a variety of services to virtual and telephone platforms, heightening sanitation and health protocols in facilities, providing resources, and creating online trainings.



**20**

hotel rooms designated for survivors of DV

Despite all these difficulties, service providers continue to display resiliency in adapting to survivors needs and serving clients during the pandemic. The Site 47 Shelter-in-Place hotel is an example of this resiliency. A collaboration between the City and County of San Francisco’ COVID-19 Command Center (CCC), the Department on the Status of Women, and the Office of Transgender initiatives created and supported a confidential referral process to a Shelter in Place (SIP) Hotel for adult women fleeing gender-based violence. Beginning in September 2020, 20 hotel rooms were dedicated to referrals for cisgender, transgender, and queer adult women ages 18 and older fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence. All 20 rooms were filled

by early December 2020.

The District Attorney’s Office, Victim Services Division, also provided housing as one COVID response measure. The DA’s Office works with Veritas, a San Francisco-based real estate management company, who donated 20 furnished apartment units for use by survivors of domestic violence. The program provided the apartments for temporary 90-day safe housing stays and was managed by seven community agencies. A total of 8 single adults and 11 families (19 adults and 16 minor children) were placed in the units. The DA’s Office also partnered with Lyft and Airbnb to provide funds for transportation and emergency stays for survivors in San Francisco at the start of the pandemic.

## Chapter 1: Child Abuse

Child abuse is any act or failure to act that endangers a child’s physical or emotional health and development. Child abuse often involves a person the child knows, such as a relative, babysitter, friend, or acquaintance. There are four statutorily recognized forms of child abuse.<sup>10</sup>

Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Neglect
The intentional use of physical force that can result in physical harm. Examples include hitting, kicking, shaking, burning, or other shows of force against a child.	Involves pressuring or forcing a child to engage in sexual acts. It includes behaviors such as fondling, penetration, and exposing a child to other sexual activities.	Refers to behaviors that harm a child’s self-worth or emotional well-being. Examples include name calling, shaming, rejection, withholding love, and threatening.	The failure to meet a child’s basic physical and emotional needs. These needs include housing, food, clothing, education, and access to medical care.

### Impacts of Child Abuse

Children who are abused suffer immediate physical injuries, as well as emotional and psychological issues. Over the long term, a child’s exposure to violence leads to increased risk of injury, medical and mental health challenges, future violence victimization and perpetration, substance abuse and other risky behaviors, sexually transmitted infections, delayed brain development, reproductive health problems, involvement in sex trafficking, lower educational attainment, and/or reduced employment opportunities.

Nationally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that the total lifetime economic burden associated with child abuse and neglect was approximately \$124 billion in 2008 and is comparable to widespread public health issues such as stroke and Type 2 diabetes.<sup>11</sup>

### National and State Prevalence of Child Abuse

The CDC estimates that at least 1 in 7 children have experienced child abuse and/or neglect in the past year, and this is likely an underestimate. For children in poverty, rates of substantiated abuse are 5 times higher than for children in families of higher socio-economic status.<sup>12</sup>

In California, 1 out of every 19 children were reported as victims of maltreatment in 2017 leading to over 71,000 substantiated survivors of child abuse that year. A recent report from Safe & Sound

# 1 in 7

children have experienced child abuse or neglect in the past year in the US



Rates of substantiated abuse for children in poverty are

# 5 times

greater than for children in families of higher socioeconomic status

<sup>10</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect*, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/fastfact.html>

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

estimates that the cumulative lifetime costs associated with victims with verified cases of abuse in California is \$23.9 billion. Given that child abuse is underreported, the total economic burden to the state could be billions more.<sup>13</sup>

#### Protective factors for child abuse<sup>14</sup>

When families and communities have strong protective factors, families are able to practice positive parenting skills, meet family needs, and address life’s challenges.

Individual	Community
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social and Emotional Competence of Children</li> <li>• Knowledge of Child Development</li> <li>• Parental Resilience</li> <li>• Social Connections</li> <li>• Concrete Support in Times of Need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies that provide economic supports and stability</li> <li>• Policies that provide parental skills and education</li> <li>• Quality childcare</li> <li>• Positive community environments created by strong institutions (<i>e.g.</i>, schools, faith centers, community centers)</li> <li>• Access to services, resources, and public space</li> <li>• Policies and interventions against violence</li> </ul>

#### Risk factors for child abuse<sup>15</sup>

Parents / Caregivers	Families	Community
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of understanding about children’s needs, child development, and parenting skills</li> <li>• History of abuse in the family</li> <li>• Substance abuse or mental health issues</li> <li>• Low levels of education</li> <li>• Large number of dependent children</li> <li>• Financial challenges or difficulties</li> <li>• Thoughts and emotions supporting abusive behaviors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social isolation</li> <li>• Family disorganization, dissolution, and violence (including intimate partner violence)</li> <li>• Parenting stress, including those associated with young, transient, or unsupported caregivers</li> <li>• Poor parent-child relationships and negative interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socioeconomic inequality and poverty</li> <li>• High unemployment rates</li> <li>• Lack of adequate and affordable housing</li> <li>• Homelessness</li> <li>• Community violence</li> <li>• Substance abuse</li> <li>• Systemic racism</li> </ul>

<sup>13</sup> Safe & Sound, *The Economics of Child Abuse: A Study of California*, 2021.

[https://economics.safeandsound.org/static\\_reports/2021CA\\_Snapshot.pdf](https://economics.safeandsound.org/static_reports/2021CA_Snapshot.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Risk and Protective Factors*, 2020.

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/riskprotectivefactors.html>

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.



## Data Sources

The data in this chapter was provided by the following City and County of San Francisco agencies and community-based organizations:

- Adult Probation Department
- Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services
- Department of Emergency Management
- Department of Public Health
- District Attorney’s Office
- Police Department
- Safe & Sound

## Prevalence

### Child Abuse Reports

Family and Children’s Services (FCS) is a division of the Human Services Agency that protects children from abuse and works in partnership with community-based organizations to support families in raising children in safe, nurturing homes. Allegations of child abuse come to FCS via its confidential hotline, open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Calls may come from concerned members of the public or mandated reporters, such as educators, childcare providers or medical professionals. Between FY 2019 and FY 2020, child abuse reports to FCS remained relatively steady from 5,124 to 5,230 allegations. Figure 1 shows the number of child abuse allegations for the past years, from FY 2010-FY 2020.

**5,230**

child abuse allegations  
in FY 2020


**1,788**

child maltreatment  
reports from mandated  
school reporters in SY  
2020

**411**

911 calls related to child  
abuse in FY 2020

Figure 1: Number of Child Abuse Allegations in San Francisco, FY 2010-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services

Figure 2 shows the number of child abuse allegations by type in FY 2019 and FY 2020, as well as the percent change between the two years. This table includes data about the child’s abuse allegation type of the highest severity. If a child had multiple allegations, only one of those allegations will be counted in this table. The most prevalent form of abuse in both FY 2019 and FY 2020 was general neglect, followed by physical abuse. Overall, there was only a slight increase of Child Abuse Allegations from FY 2019 to FY 2020 of approximately 2%. However, the number of emotional abuse allegations increased by around 22%. The number of allegations of children at risk of abuse due to their sibling having been abused marked the biggest decrease of 17%.

Figure 2: Number of Child Abuse Allegations by Allegation Type, FY 2019-FY 2020

ALLEGATION TYPE	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
GENERAL NEGLECT	2,410 (47%)	2,520 (48%)	5%
PHYSICAL ABUSE	1,122 (22%)	1,063 (20%)	-5%
EMOTIONAL ABUSE	577 (11%)	704 (13%)	22%
AT RISK, SIBLING ABUSED	559 (11%)	462 (9%)	-17%
SEXUAL ABUSE	328 (6%)	343 (7%)	5%
CARETAKER ABSENCE/INCAPACITY	83 (2%)	84 (2%)	1%
SEVERE NEGLECT	38 (1%)	36 (1%)	-5%
EXPLOITATION	7 (0.1%)	18 (0.1%)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,124 (100%)</b>	<b>5,230 (100%)</b>	<b>2%</b>

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services




**78%**

of 911 calls related to child abuse in FY 2020 were for sexual abuse under 15 years

### 911 Calls

Another measure of the prevalence of child abuse is through 911 calls to the Department of Emergency Management. Overall, the number of 911 calls regarding child abuse is much lower than other forms of abuse. This may be because there are other methods for reporting child abuse, either through Family and Children’s Services or other available hotlines. This may also be a result of other issues, such as societal beliefs and attitudes about families’ privacy. Figure 3 shows the number of calls to 911 related to child abuse in FY 2020, by call type. FY 2019 and FY 2020 saw 432 and 411 calls, respectively, which represents a 5% decrease in total number of 911 calls regarding child abuse. While sexual abuse under 15 years is not coded as child abuse, it is important to recognize dispatches of this type as it helps show the full extent of abuse. Additionally, these calls continue to represent the majority of calls related to child abuse, representing 83% of all calls related to child abuse in FY 2019 and 78% of all calls related to child abuse in FY 2020.

Figure 3: Calls to 911 Related to Child Abuse by Call Type, FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Department of Emergency Management



**38%**

of reports in FY 2020 come from SFUSD Elementary Schools

### Mandated Reporters

Child-serving professionals, such as teachers, coaches, and doctors, are required to recognize signs of child abuse and report suspected abuse to FCS as mandated reporters. This helps ensure that children who have been or are suspected of being abused are identified and that they and their families are connected to the support they need.

Figure 4 provides the number of reports by reporter type. The number of reports has varied over the years, with 1,788 total reports in SY 2020. The majority of reports come from SFUSD Elementary Schools, representing 41% of reports in SY 2020, as in previous years.

Figure 4: Children with Maltreatment Reports by School Reporter Type and School Year, SY 2018-SY 2020

REPORTER TYPE	SY 2018	SY 2019	SY 2020	3-YEAR AVERAGE
SFUSD CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS & PRESCHOOLS	19	22	19	20
NON-SFUSD PRESCHOOLS & DAYCARE CENTERS	98	109	56	88
SFUSD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	781	707	732	740
SFUSD MIDDLE SCHOOLS	307	338	245	297
SFUSD HIGH SCHOOLS	281	307	355	314
SFUSD MIXED GRADES	3	180	193	125
PRIVATE SCHOOLS	138	158	141	146
SFUSD ADMIN	6	21	27	18
OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICT	9	6	14	10
OTHER (NO SCHOOL IDENTIFIED)	143	0	6	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,785</b>	<b>1,848</b>	<b>1,788</b>	<b>1807</b>

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services

### Mandated Reporter Trainings

In FY 2019, Safe & Sound conducted in-person mandated reporter trainings for 1,543 child-serving professionals to recognize and report child abuse. In FY 2020, 1,298 child-serving professionals attended the trainings. The State of California also provides an on-line mandated reporter training for both early childhood educators and school-age educators. SFUSD has created its own on-line training to train its staff every year. In FY 2019, 195 trainings were conducted virtually. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, some mandated reporter trainings in FY 2020 were conducted in a virtual format.

### System Response

**533**

of 5,230 child abuse cases substantiated (FY 2020)

**253**

arrests related to child abuse (FY 2020)

**52**

cases received by the District Attorney (FY 2020)

**33**

cases prosecuted by the District Attorney (FY 2020)

## Substantiating Allegations

Based on information taken during the hotline call or referral, FCS social workers assess information related to suspicion of child abuse. There are three possible pathways, shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Pathways for substantiating child abuse allegations






Figure 6 shows that the number of substantiated cases of child abuse in San Francisco has decreased fairly significantly over time. However, this trend has reversed in the past two years. In FY 2020, 533 of 5,230 total cases were substantiated (representing 10% of total cases). Figure 7 shows the number of substantiated cases of child abuse per 1,000 children in San Francisco over the past ten calendar years. The trend is the same as that in Figure 6, showing a decrease in substantiated cases of child abuse over time.

Figure 6: California Child Welfare Indicators Project: Substantiated Cases of Child Abuse in San Francisco, FY 2010-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services


Figure 7: California Child Welfare Indicators Project: Substantiated Cases of Child Abuse per 1,000 Children in San Francisco, CY 2009-CY 2019



Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services

Reports of child abuse may go to Family and Children’s Services or directly to the Police Department in some instances. FCS must cross-report all substantiated cases of child abuse to the Police Department, but not all cases meet the criminal definition of child abuse. The cases that do not meet the criminal definition of child abuse are not included in the incidents reported in Figure 8 below. Not all child abuse incidents reported to the Police Department come from FCS as other sources can also report child abuse incidents to the police. A smaller subset of cases result in an arrest. An even smaller subset of cases is investigated by the Special Victims Unit (SVU) within the Police Department. Figure 8 shows the number of cases that moved through the system from incident report to cases being further investigated by the SFPD SVU in FY 2019 and FY 2020 as well as the percent change between the two years. Compared to FY 2019, there was a 23% decrease in the number of incidents reported to the Police Department, and the number of cases that SVU investigated decreased by 44%. The number of arrests also decreased by 26%.

Figure 8: System Response to Child Abuse Incidents Reported, FY 2019 and FY 2020




Source: San Francisco Police Department

## Prosecutions


The District Attorney’s Child Abuse and Sexual Assault (CASA) Unit reviews all child abuse incidents and prosecutes cases of physical or sexual assault against children, child endangerment, human trafficking of children, and cases involving child sexual abuse materials. Figure 9 shows the total number of child abuse cases received and prosecuted by the District Attorney’s Office over the past few years. Between FY 2019 and FY 2020, the prosecution rate increased by 13%. Figure 10 shows the types of child abuse cases that are prosecuted by the District Attorney’s Office. Cases involving child sexual abuse materials represented the largest share of cases prosecuted FY 2020, representing 58% of total cases prosecuted. In FY 2018 and FY 2019, cases prosecuted were more evenly distributed across types of child abuse.

Figure 9: Cases of Child Abuse Received and Prosecuted, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco District Attorney’s Office

Figure 10: Types of Child Abuse Prosecuted, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco District Attorney’s Office



2

convictions through jury trial in FY 2020

### Convictions

In FY 2018, there were seven cases that went to trial and resulted in a conviction on at least one count, as reported by the District Attorney’s Office. Five of the cases in FY 2018 that resulted in jury trial were child sexual abuse cases. In FY 2019, there were three jury trials with convictions, and in FY 2020 there were two jury trials with convictions. In both FY 2019 and FY 2020, the jury trials with convictions resulted from child sexual abuse cases.

### Child Deaths

The Child Death Review Team (CDRT), co-chaired by the Department of Public Health and Safe & Sound, facilitates a review of all unexpected child deaths reported to the San Francisco Medical Examiner’s Office. This coordinated review helps prevent future deaths and improve the health and safety of San Francisco’s children, including identification of potential child abuse in a home. In FY 2019, CDRT reviewed cases for children ages 18 years and under. However, in FY 2020, beginning in August 2020, CDRT reviewed cases for persons age 25 years and younger. Thus, FY 2020 has a greater number of cases reviewed by CDRT than FY 2019. In FY 2019, the Child Death Review Team reviewed a total of 12 child deaths. In FY 2020, the Child Death Review Team reviewed a total of 27 child deaths. From the cases reviewed both years, there were no apparent trends in child deaths.

Figure 11: Child Death Review Team: Child Deaths in San Francisco, FY 2019-FY 2020

CHILD DEATHS	FY 2019	FY 2020
UNEXPECTED CHILD DEATHS	10	19
HOMICIDES	2	8

Source: Safe & Sound

### Demographics of Victims



32%

of victims with substantiated allegations were Black or African American

#### Race/Ethnicity


Figure 12 shows the race/ethnicity of a child in a substantiated allegation compared to the population of San Francisco under 20 years old. Latinx and Black children are overrepresented in number of substantiated allegations. Black children make up 32% of the victims with substantiated allegations despite Black children representing 10% of the overall San Francisco population. Latinx children make up 39% of the total victims with substantiated allegations despite Latinx people representing 24% of the overall San Francisco population. Compared to FY2019, the share of Latinx child victims has increased by 7%; and the share of Black child victims has decreased by 7%.

White and Asian children were less likely to be victims of child abuse, as indicated by the number of substantiated allegations in comparison to



their representation in the San Francisco population. White children made up 14% of substantiated allegations in FY 2020. Asian and Pacific Islander children made up 13% of substantiated allegations in FY 2020.

*Figure 12: Race/Ethnicity of Child in Substantiated Allegation Compared to the San Francisco Population Under 20,<sup>16</sup> FY 2020*




Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services

The Children’s Advocacy Center (CAC), which provides trauma-informed, child-focused forensic interviews and supportive services to children who have been abused, also provides demographic information for clients. Of clients served by the Children’s Advocacy Center in FY 2019 and 2020, 47% and 54% identified as Latinx, respectively. Black children represented 28% of victims served by the Children’s Advocacy Center but only represent 10% of the San Francisco population.

<sup>16</sup> Source for San Francisco population under 20 by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentages are estimates and include all adults and children in San Francisco County under 20 years of age. Each racial category represents race alone or in combination with another race.

Figure 13: Children's Advocacy Center: Race/Ethnicity of Child Victims Compared to the San Francisco Population Under 20,<sup>17</sup> FY 2020



Source: Safe & Sound



**52%**  
of victims with  
substantiated  
allegations were male

### Gender

As seen in Figure 14, boys reported child abuse at a higher rate than girls (52% of substantiated allegations compared to 48% of substantiated allegations in FY 2020, respectively). This breakdown is very similar to the proportion of boys and girls in San Francisco. In 2020, boys represented 51% of the San Francisco population, and girls represented 49% of the San Francisco population.<sup>18</sup> In CY 2018, girls experience child abuse at a higher rate than boys (57% compared to 43%). Girls more frequently experienced sexual abuse, severe neglect, and/or exploitation than boys and were deemed more at risk of abuse due to increased history of siblings being abused. Boys were more likely to be victims of general neglect, physical abuse, and emotional abuse. However, the majority of clients (68%) that the Children's Advocacy Center served were female.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Kids Data, *Child Population, by Age Group and Gender, 2020*. <https://www.kidsdata.org/topic/34/child-population-age-gender/table#fmt=141&loc=265&tf=110&ch=1433,926,927,1434,1435,372,78,77,79&sortColumnId=0&sortType=asc>

Figure 14: Substantiated Allegations by Type and Gender of Child, FY 2020

ALLEGATION TYPE	MALE	FEMALE	GENDERQUEER/ GENDER NON-BINARY	TOTAL (% OF TOTAL)
GENERAL NEGLECT	193	179	1	373 (70%)
PHYSICAL ABUSE	31	22	0	53 (10%)
AT RISK, SIBLING ABUSED	4	11	0	15 (3%)
EMOTIONAL ABUSE	23	9	0	32 (6%)
SEXUAL ABUSE	3	7	0	10 (2%)
CARETAKER ABSENCE/INCAPACITY	17	17	0	34 (6%)
SEVERE NEGLECT	6	9	0	15 (3%)
EXPLOITATION	0	1	0	1 (0.2%)
<b>TOTAL (% OF TOTAL)</b>	<b>277 (52%)</b>	<b>255 (48%)</b>	<b>1 (0.2%)</b>	<b>533 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children's Services


Figure 15: Children's Advocacy Center: Gender of Child Victims, FY 2020

GENDER OF VICTIM	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
MALE	79 (32%)	34 (30%)	-57%
FEMALE	169 (68%)	76 (68%)	-55%
TRANSGENDER MALE	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	
UNKNOWN	1 (0.4%)	1 (1%)	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>248 (100%)</b>	<b>112 (100%)</b>	<b>-55%</b>

Source: Safe & Sound

The CAC also reports the types of abuse experienced by victims, obtained through interviews. Based on the data presented in Figure 16, girls who were served by the CAC are far more likely to experience sexual abuse than boys. Boys and girls were more similarly likely to experience physical abuse and be witnesses to violence.

Figure 16: Children's Advocacy Center: Type of Abuse Based on Interview by Gender, FY 2020 (n=111)



Source: Safe & Sound

## Age

Based on the total number of abuse referrals to Family and Children's Services, similar shares of children in the 0-5, 6-10, and 11-17 age ranges were victims of alleged child abuse, as seen in Figure 17. There was an 10% increase in share of children with abuse referrals age 11-17 in FY 2020 compared to FY 2019.

Figure 17: Age of Children with Abuse Referrals, FY 2020

AGE GROUP	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
0-5	1,623 (32%)	1,591 (30%)	-2%
6-10	1,542 (30%)	1,490 (28%)	-3%
11-17	1,959 (38%)	2,149 (41%)	10%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,124 (100%)</b>	<b>5,230 (100%)</b>	<b>2%</b>

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children's Services

The California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) provides a more nuanced breakdown of the age of children with substantiated child abuse allegations, as seen in Figure 18. Infants under the age of one experience child abuse at much higher rates than other age groups; 9.5 out of 1,000 children under the age of one experienced child abuse in CY 2018, and 9.9 out of 1,000 children under the age of one experienced child abuse in CY 2019.

Figure 18: California Child Welfare Indicators Project: Number of Substantiated Child Abuse Allegations in San Francisco in Every 1,000, by Age-Group, CY 2018-CY 2019

AGE GROUP	CY 2018	CY 2019	% CHANGE
UNDER 1	9.5	9.9	4%
1-2	3.4	3.8	12%
3-5	3.1	3.8	23%
6-10	3.2	2.9	-9%
11-15	3.7	3.8	3%
16-17	3.3	3.7	12%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services

Approximately half of clients served by the Children’s Advocacy Center were between the ages of 11 and 17 years.

Figure 19: Children's Advocacy Center: Age of Child Victims, FY 2019-FY 2020

AGE OF VICTIMS	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
0-5 YEARS OLD	38 (15%)	16 (14%)	-58%
6-10 YEARS OLD	74 (30%)	33 (29%)	-55%
11-17 YEARS OLD	135 (45%)	62 (55%)	-54%

Source: Safe & Sound

## Services Available for Survivors



Figure 20 provides a description of services available for survivors of child abuse as well as a snapshot of the number of clients served by each service. See Appendix B for a full description of the services available to survivors and perpetrators.

Figure 20: Services Available for Survivors of Child Abuse

SERVICE	DESCRIPTION	CLIENTS SERVED
<b>CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER</b>	Trauma-informed, child-focused forensic interviews and supportive services to children who have been abused.	FY 2019: 246 clients FY 2020: 111 clients
<b>TALK LINE PARENTAL SUPPORT</b>	24/7 telephone support and crisis counseling to parents and caregivers.	FY 2019: 6,047 incoming and outgoing calls; 7,284 hours of calls FY 2020: 6,357 incoming and outgoing calls
<b>INTEGRATED FAMILY SERVICE (IFS)</b>	Two-generation, data-informed approach providing intensive case management aimed at strengthening protective factors (see page 18).	FY 2019: 72 families; 148 total participants FY 2020: 65 families; 124 total participants
<b>FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS</b>	First 5 San Francisco's Family Resource Center (FRC) Initiative is a network of family resource centers that operates across the city serving specific neighborhoods as well as city-wide populations. FRCs are family-serving organizations that provide safe and welcoming places for families to learn about child development, build parenting skills, and engage in peer support. For families dealing with crises, FRCs provide basic needs resources, referrals, and comprehensive case management.	26 Family Resource Centers FY 2019: 8441 participants FY 2020: 6818 participants*  * FRC participant counts are only for unduplicated adults and children with formal enrollment in FRC programming. In order to reduce as many barriers to participation and also to increase social connections during the pandemic as much as possible, participants were permitted to attend most remote programming without formal enrollment after March 16, 2020. Additionally, Family Resource Centers saw significant increases in utilization of food pantries and diaper banks, for which unduplicated counts are not collected.
<b>SAFETY LESSONS FOR CHILDREN</b>	Yearly lessons teaching personal safety skills to elementary school children. Safety lessons were paused in March 2020 due to shelter-in-place and the COVID-19 pandemic and resumed in the Fall 2020 semester.	FY 2019: 3,199 children FY 2020: 3,156 children
<b>DISTRICT ATTORNEY VICTIM SERVICES</b>	Provide support to child witnesses of domestic violence and victims of child abuse, including adults who experienced physical abuse or sexual assault as children.	FY 2019: 88 child witnesses of DV; 566 victims of child abuse

		FY 2020: 141 child witnesses of DV; 352 child abuse victims
<b>MAPPING RESOURCES TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE</b>	An asset mapping exercise that identifies programs in San Francisco that support children (full list of programs available at the City's open data portal). <sup>19</sup>	375 distinct programs; more than \$143 million in City spending

### Healthcare Services: Child Trauma Research Program

The University of California, San Francisco's (UCSF) Child Trauma Research Program (CTRP), based at San Francisco General Hospital, supports young children (ages 0-5 years) who have been exposed to a broad range of traumas by providing intensive mental health services. Traumas may include traumas that are outside the forms of child abuse and maltreatment recorded in FCS data yet are risk factors for child abuse. Traumas may include domestic violence, separation from primary caregiver, physical abuse, community violence, loss of close relation(s), sexual abuse, and child neglect. In FY 2020, CTRP served 209 families compared to only 160 families served by CTRP in FY 2019 representing a 31% increase in number of families served between the two years. Figure 21 shows the type of trauma experienced by children served by CTRP. Note that one child may experience multiple forms of abuse. The most prevalent form of trauma experienced by clients in FY 2020 was domestic violence. This report presents child abuse, elder abuse, and domestic violence separately, but it is important to remember that all forms of family violence are interconnected.

*Figure 21: Number of Clients Served by Type of Abuse, FY 2019-FY 2020\**

TRAUMA TYPE	FY 2019	FY 2020
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	50	114
SEPARATION FROM PRIMARY CAREGIVER	51	90
OTHER TRAUMA	27	41
SEXUAL ABUSE	14	24
COMMUNITY VIOLENCE	17	23
LOSS OF CLOSE RELATION	12	19
CHILD NEGLECT	5	16
PHYSICAL ABUSE	12	13

Source: Department of Public Health

\*Each child may experience multiple forms of trauma. These numbers do not represent unique individuals.

### Perpetrators

Data from the Police Department describes the race/ethnicity, gender, and age of suspects in child abuse cases.


<sup>19</sup> City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Controller, City Performance, *Mapping Resources to Prevent Child Abuse in San Francisco*, 2019.

<https://sfcontroller.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Auditing/Mapping%20Resources%20to%20Prevent%20Child%20Abuse%20in%20San%20Francisco.pdf>

## Race/Ethnicity

Figure 22 shows the race/ethnicity of child abuse suspects compared to the general San Francisco Population. Black and Latinx suspects are disproportionately represented. Please refer to the note about disproportionality in the criminal justice system in this report's introduction.

Figure 22: Race/Ethnicity of Child Abuse Suspects Compared to General San Francisco Population,<sup>20</sup> FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department



**68%**

of suspects are male

## Gender

Figure 23 shows data from the San Francisco Police Department on the gender of child abuse suspects. Men represent the majority of suspects; approximately 68% of suspects were male in FY 2020. This reflects trends from previous years.

<sup>20</sup> Source for general San Francisco population by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentages are estimates and include all adults and children in San Francisco City.



Figure 23: Gender of Child Abuse Suspects, FY 2020

GENDER OF SUSPECT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
MALE	589 (71%)	452 (68%)	-23%
FEMALE	222 (27%)	188 (28%)	-15%
UNKNOWN	22 (3%)	26 (4%)	18%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>833 (100%)</b>	<b>666 (100%)</b>	<b>-20%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

## Age

Figure 24 provides information on the age of child abuse suspects. In FY 2020, about half of all suspects were between 18 and 39 years of age.

Figure 24: Age of Child Abuse Suspects, FY 2020


AGE OF SUSPECT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
UNDER-18	31 (4%)	26 (4%)	-16%
18-29	149 (18%)	150 (23%)	1%
30-39	269 (32%)	175 (26%)	-35%
40-49	127 (15%)	98 (15%)	-23%
50-59	61 (7%)	38 (6%)	-38%
60+	26 (3%)	12 (2%)	-54%
UNKNOWN	170 (20%)	167 (25%)	-2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>833 (100%)</b>	<b>666 (100%)</b>	<b>-20%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

## Relationship to Victim

Based on data from Family and Children's Services, 93% of perpetrators in substantiated cases in FY 2019 and 91% of perpetrators in substantiated cases in FY 2020 were a parent or step-parent of the victim. The remaining perpetrators were other family members and others.

## Services Available for Perpetrators



See Appendix B for a full description of the services available to victims and perpetrators.

### Adult Probation

The Adult Probation Domestic Violence Unit supervises a caseload specific to child abuse offenders. In FY 2019 and FY 2020, 15 and 17 clients were supervised on the child abuse caseload, respectively. The majority of the caseload was comprised of men (79% of caseload in FY 2019 and 69% of caseload in FY 2020).

### Child Abuse Intervention Program

The Child Abuse Intervention Program (CAIP) is a treatment program designed in accordance with the California Penal Code as a condition of probation for those convicted of a child abuse offense. In FY 2018, CAIP served a total of nine clients, four of whom completed the program. In FY 2019, CAIP served five clients, four of whom completed the program.

## Chapter 2: Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse

Elder abuse may be physical, emotional, sexual, or financial, or it may take the form of neglect – either neglect by another person or self-neglect. This report includes data on elders, defined as individuals 65 years of age and older, as well as on dependent adults, defined as individuals between 18 and 64 years of age with “physical or mental limitations that restrict their ability to carry out normal activities or to protect their rights.”<sup>21</sup> Below are types of abuse that are commonly accepted as the major categories of elder abuse.<sup>22</sup>

<b>Physical Abuse</b>	Inflicting, or threatening to inflict, physical pain or injury on a vulnerable elder, or depriving them of a basic need.
<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	Non-consensual sexual contact of any kind, coercing an elder to witness sexual behaviors.
<b>Emotional Abuse</b>	Inflicting mental pain, anguish, or distress on an elder person through verbal or nonverbal acts.
<b>Exploitation</b>	Illegal taking, misuse, or concealment of funds, property, or assets of a vulnerable elder.
<b>Neglect</b>	Refusal or failure by those responsible to provide food, shelter, health care, or protection for a vulnerable elder.
<b>Abandonment</b>	The desertion of a vulnerable elder by anyone who has assumed the responsibility for care or custody of that person.

### Impacts of Elder Abuse

The trauma of elder abuse results in severe, negative impacts on an individual’s quality of life and ability to live independently. Victims of elder abuse are faced with worse health outcomes, including both physical and psychological impacts. Elders who have experienced abuse are more likely to experience persistent pain and soreness, increased susceptibility to new illnesses, exacerbation of pre-existing

<sup>21</sup> “Dependent Adult” as defined by the California Constitution, Welfare and Institutions Code, Division 9, Part 3, Chapter 11: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, Article 2: Definitions.

<sup>22</sup> Center of Excellence on Elder Abuse and Neglect, University of California, Irvine, *Resources: What is Abuse?*, 2021. <http://www.centeronelderabuse.org/resources.asp>

conditions, and increased risk for premature death. Research has found that elders who have experienced abuse have a 300% higher risk of death than elders who have not experienced abuse.<sup>23</sup> Victims are also more likely to experience clinical issues, such as depression, suicide, and social isolation.

At a national level, elder abuse has significant financial ramifications. Elder abuse contributes \$5.3 billion to the nation's annual health expenditures and results in \$2.8 billion in Medicaid hospital costs alone for victims who experience abuse in nursing home settings. Financial abuse alone costs older Americans \$2.6 billion annually.<sup>24</sup>

### National and State Prevalence of Elder Abuse

According to national statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice, 10% of adults aged 65 years or older experience some form of elder abuse in a given year, with some adults experiencing multiple forms of abuse.<sup>25</sup> In California, it is estimated that over 200,000 elders experience abuse each year and that every three minutes, an elder or dependent adult is abused.<sup>26</sup> However, as with other forms of abuse, elder abuse is frequently underreported. The Department of Justice estimates that only 1 in 57 cases of caregiver neglect, 1 in 44 cases of financial exploitation, 1 in 20 cases of physical abuse, and 1 in 12 cases of psychological abuse are reported.<sup>27</sup>

**300%**

higher risk of death for elder abuse victims

**\$5.3 billion**

in annual health expenditures related to elder abuse



In 2030, the elder population in California is projected to reach

**10 million**

### Growing Aging Population

The population of individuals 65 years and older is growing as the Baby Boomer generation ages. In California, the elder population is projected to grow from six million in 2020 to nearly 10 million in 2030, with growth across all racial and ethnic groups. The Public Policy Institute of California estimates that the number of elders who will face difficulty in self-care will almost double by 2030 to over one million individuals.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>23</sup> National Council on Aging, *Elder Abuse Facts*. <https://www.ncoa.org/public-policy-action/elder-justice/elder-abuse-facts/>

<sup>24</sup> National Center on Elder Abuse, *Statistics and Data*. <https://ncea.acl.gov/About-Us/What-We-Do/Research/Statistics-and-Data.aspx#impact>

<sup>25</sup> U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, *Elder Abuse Fact Sheet*. <https://www.justice.gov/file/1098056/download>

<sup>26</sup> Center of Excellence on Elder Abuse and Neglect, University of California, Irvine, *Elder Abuse Issue Brief*, 2013. [http://www.centeronelderabuse.org/docs/COE\\_IssueBrief2013\\_final.pdf](http://www.centeronelderabuse.org/docs/COE_IssueBrief2013_final.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, *Elder Abuse Fact Sheet*. <https://www.justice.gov/file/1098056/download>

<sup>28</sup> Public Policy Institute of California, *Planning for California's Growing Senior Population*, 2015. <https://www.ppic.org/publication/planning-for-californias-growing-senior-population/>

Based on these projections for a rapidly aging population in California and nationally, there is a significant need to identify, address, and prevent elder abuse and support victims who are impacted

## Data Sources

The data in this chapter was provided by the following City and County of San Francisco agencies and community-based organizations:

- District Attorney's Office
- Elder Abuse Forensic Center
- Adult Protective Services, Human Services Agency
- Police Department
- Sheriff's Department
- 27 community-based organizations

## Prevalence

The most comprehensive data on elder and dependent adult abuse in San Francisco comes from Adult Protective Services (APS). APS is operated by the Department of Aging and Adult Services within the Human Services Agency. APS 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 receives reports of abuse through their 24-hour hotline and (for non-urgent cases) online. Social workers assess each referral and determine an appropriate response. They work with law enforcement, medical services, and the District Attorney's Office, as well as experts from the Elder Abuse Forensic Center, to investigate and intervene in cases where abuse is taking place. APS may also conclude, following investigation, that an allegation is unsubstantiated.

Figure 25 shows both elder abuse and dependent adult abuse reports received and substantiated over the last six years. In this time, the number of reports received has been relatively consistent with a 6% increase between FY 2015 and FY 2020. However, comparing the percent of cases substantiated over time shows that the number of reports that have been substantiated has increased by 23%. There were 7,204 total reports of elder and dependent adult abuse in FY 2020. Of the reports in FY 2020, 4,820 involved a senior age 65 and over and 1,943 involved a dependent adult aged 18-59. The remaining 441 reports did not include age data from APS.





Figure 25: Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse: Reports Received and Substantiated, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

Figure 26 and Figure 27 break out the number of elder abuse and dependent adult abuse referrals and substantiations for FY 2019 and FY 2020. There has been a 4% increase in the number of elder abuse referrals from FY 2019 to FY 2020 while there has been a 31% decrease in the number of dependent adult abuse referrals. Across both elder abuse and dependent abuse cases, the percent of cases substantiated is approximately the same in FY 2020. However, dependent adult abuse cases saw a much larger increase in number of cases substantiated between FY 2019 and FY 2020 than did elder abuse cases (36% increase in substantiations of dependent adult abuse cases and 4% elder abuse cases).

Figure 26: Elder Abuse: Referrals and Substantiations, FY 2019-FY 2020

ELDER ABUSE REPORTS	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
REPORTS RECEIVED	4,618	4,820	4%
REPORTS SUBSTANTIATED	2,510	2,725	9%
% SUBSTANTIATED	54%	57%	4%

Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

Figure 27: Dependent Adult Abuse: Referrals and Substantiations, FY 2019-FY 2020

DEPENDENT ABUSE REPORTS	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
REPORTS RECEIVED	2,807	1,943	-31%
REPORTS SUBSTANTIATED	1,148	1,081	-6%
% SUBSTANTIATED	41%	56%	36%

Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

Figure 28 shows the number of substantiated reports of self-neglect in FY 2019 and FY 2020. There has been a 7% increase in the number of substantiated elder abuse self-neglect cases and a 4% decrease in the number of substantiated dependent adult abuse self-neglect cases between FY 2019 and FY 2020.

Figure 28: Substantiated Reports of Self-Neglect, FY 2019-FY 2020

SUBSTANTIATED SELF-NEGLECT REPORTS	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
ELDER ABUSE	1,558 (65%)	1,664 (67%)	7%
DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE	839 (35%)	808 (33%)	-4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,397 (100%)</b>	<b>2,472 (100%)</b>	<b>3%</b>

Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

Figure 29 and Figure 30 describe the types of abuse experienced by elder abuse and dependent adult abuse victims. There may be more than one allegation of abuse per client. Data about individuals experiencing other forms of abuse, including isolation, abandonment, sexual and abduction is limited and has been withheld to protect client privacy. The most prevalent form of abuse reported in FY 2019 was psychological or emotional abuse. The most prevalent form of abuse reported in FY 2020 was financial abuse, representing 40% of cases. There has been a 28% increase in reports of elder physical abuse cases, while dependent adult abuse cases saw a 12% decrease in physical abuse cases from FY 2019 to FY 2020.

Figure 29: Types of Abuse: Elder Abuse, FY 2019-FY 2020

TYPE OF ELDER ABUSE	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
PSYCHOLOGICAL/EMOTIONAL	408 (36%)	436 (30%)	7%
FINANCIAL	378 (33%)	583 (40%)	54%
PHYSICAL	193 (17%)	247 (17%)	28%
NEGLECT	150 (13%)	169 (12%)	13%
ISOLATION	*	14 (1%)	
ABANDONMENT	*	12 (1%)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,129 (100%)</b>	<b>1,461 (100%)</b>	<b>6%</b>

\*DATA HAS BEEN WITHHELD TO PROTECT CLIENT PRIVACY (N<10). DATA NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS.

Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

Figure 30: Types of Abuse: Dependent Adult Abuse, FY 2019-FY 2020

TYPE OF DEPENDENT ADULT ABUSE	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
PSYCHOLOGICAL/EMOTIONAL	184 (39%)	156 (37%)	-15%
FINANCIAL	95 (20%)	92 (22%)	-3%
PHYSICAL	131 (28%)	115 (27%)	-12%
NEGLECT	57 (12%)	48 (11%)	-16%
SEXUAL	*	15 (4%)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>467 (100%)</b>	<b>436 (100%)</b>	<b>-9%</b>

\*DATA HAS BEEN WITHHELD TO PROTECT CLIENT PRIVACY (N<10). DATA NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS.

Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services




**14%**

increase in 911 Calls  
Relating to Elder  
Abuse  
(FY 2019-FY 2020)

Another measure of the prevalence of elder abuse is through 911 calls to the Department of Emergency Management. Figure 31 shows the number of 911 calls concerning elder abuse in the past six years. There has been a 5% decrease in total number of calls between FY 2015 and FY 2020. However, from FY 2019 to FY 2020, there was a 14% increase in number of 911 calls relating to elder abuse. Figure 32 shows the breakdown of type of 911 call.

*Figure 31: 911 Calls Relating to Elder Abuse, FY 2015-FY 2020*



Source: San Francisco Department of Emergency Management



Figure 32: Calls to 911 Relating to Elder Abuse by Call Type, FY 2018-FY 2020

CALL	DESCRIPTION	FY 2018 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	3-YR AVG
368EA	Elder Abuse	83 (25%)	70 (49%)	101 (62%)	85
240EA	Assault/Battery (Includes Unwanted Physical Contact)	25 (16%)	26 (18%)	24 (15%)	25
470EA	Fraud	22 (14%)	28 (20%)	17 (10%)	22
910EA	Well-Being Check	21 (13%)	7 (5%)	11 (7%)	13
650EA	Threats	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	2
488EA	Petty Theft	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	1
418EA	Fight or Dispute – No Weapons Used	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	2 (1%)	3
245EA	Aggravated Assault (Severe Injuries or Objects Used to Injure)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	2
487EA	Grand Theft	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	1
211EA	Robbery	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
<b>Total Calls</b>		<b>159 (100%)</b>	<b>142 (100%)</b>	<b>162 (100%)</b>	<b>154</b>

Source: San Francisco Department of Emergency Management




**448**

elder physical abuse incidents reported (FY 2020)

### System Response


Figure 33 describes the system response to cases that are referred to the APS hotline. Of the cases that are referred to the APS hotline, a smaller subset is substantiated by APS, and then an even smaller subset of cases is investigated by the Police Department. Figure 26 and Figure 27 in the previous section show the number of cases that were substantiated by APS.

Figure 33: System Response to Cases Referred to APS Hotline




In addition to cases referred to the APS hotline, incidents may also be reported to the Police Department. Following an incident report, all incidents reported are investigated. A subset of cases is assigned and further investigated, a subset of cases results in an arrest, and a smaller subset of cases is presented to the District Attorney’s Office. Figure 34 provides data from FY 2019 and FY 2020. Figure 35 does the same for incidents of elder financial abuse. The incidents reported for elder financial abuse cases decreased from 65 in FY 2019 to only 38 in FY 2020.

Figure 34: System Response to Elder Physical Abuse Cases, FY 2019-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department

Figure 35: System Response to Elder Financial Abuse Cases, FY 2019-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department


## Demographics of Victims

The following section describes the demographics of victims who experienced abuse by others and self-neglect. Note that to protect client privacy, some demographic information has been withheld.

### Race/Ethnicity

In recent years, APS has provided more data about the demographics of victims, including race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Figure 36 shows a comparison of the percentage of victims of substantiated cases of elder abuse (EA) and dependent adult abuse (DAA) by race/ethnicity, in cases of abuse by others and self-neglect cases, compared to the San Francisco population aged 65 and older. Black victims are disproportionately represented, particularly in dependent adult cases of abuse by others. The Black/African American community represents 6% of the San Francisco population aged 65+ but represented 16% of substantiated elder victims of abuse by others and 28% of dependent adult victims of abuse by others in FY 2020. The Latino/a/x community represents 9% of the San Francisco population aged 65 and older but represented 12% of substantiated elder victims of abuse by others and 15% of dependent adult victims of abuse by others in FY 2020. Similar to cases of abuse by others, there are distinct racial disparities in self-neglect cases: Black victims are disproportionately represented in both elder abuse and dependent adult abuse cases.

Figure 36: Race/Ethnicity (Where Known) of Substantiated Cases of Abuse by Others and Self Neglect, Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Victims Compared to SF Population 65+<sup>29</sup>, FY 2020



**54%**


of victims of abuse by others were female

### Gender

Figure 37 shows the gender of substantiated cases of elder abuse (EA) and dependent adult abuse (DAA) victims of self neglect and abuse by others in FY 2020. Including both elder abuse and dependent adult abuse cases, women represented 54% of victims of abuse by others in FY 2020. In FY 2019, 57% of victims of self-neglect (including both elder abuse and dependent adult abuse) were male and 42% were female.

<sup>29</sup> Source for San Francisco adult population 65+ by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentages are estimates and include all adults in San Francisco County age 65 and older.

Figure 37: Gender of Substantiated Cases of Abuse by Others, Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Abuse Victims, FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Adult Protective Services

### Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Straight/heterosexual victims represented 65% of total victims of abuse by others in FY 2019 and 60% of total victims of abuse by others in FY 2020. A smaller percentage of victims of abuse by others identified as LGBTQ (10% in FY 2019 and 7% in FY 2020). Sexual orientation information is not available (not collected, not listed, declined/not stated) for the remaining 33% of victims of abuse by others in FY 2020 and 25% of victims of abuse by others in FY 2019.

Straight/heterosexual victims of self-neglect, including both victims of elder abuse and dependent adult abuse, represented 61% of victims in FY 2019 and 58% of victims in FY 2020. A smaller percentage of victims of self-neglect identified as LGBTQ (approximately 14% in FY 2019 and 8% in FY 2020).

### Age

Data from Adult Protective Services (APS) shows that in FY20, there were 6,676 confirmed allegations of abuse in total, 6,496 of which include data on the victim's age. Based on this data, APS finds that both the average and median age of victims is 70 years old. Note that this approach is consistent with the broader methodology used by APS; individuals with multiple confirmed allegations of abuse were duplicated in this analysis (there are 3,911 unique individuals with one or more confirmed allegations of abuse during this period).

In FY19, there were 6,315 confirmed allegations of abuse in total, 6,186 of which include data on the victim's age. Based on this data, APS finds that both the average age of victims is 69 years old and the median age is 70. Note that this approach is consistent with the broader methodology used by APS; individuals with multiple confirmed allegations of abuse were duplicated in this analysis (there are 3,755 unique individuals with one or more confirmed allegations of abuse during this period).

## Services Available for Survivors

The Elder Abuse Forensic Center, the District Attorney’s Victim Services Division, and other community-based organizations provide services for survivors of elder abuse and dependent adult abuse. See Appendix B or a full description of the services available to survivors and perpetrators.

### Elder Abuse Forensic Center



The San Francisco Elder Abuse Forensic Center (SFEAFC) is a public-private partnership between the non-profit Institute on Aging’s Elder Abuse Prevention (EAP) Program and City departments. Its mission is to prevent and combat the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elders and dependent adults in San Francisco through improved collaboration and coordination of professionals within the elder abuse network. A formal referral process to the Forensic Center is utilized by APS, based upon the relative complexity of each case and/or the need for specialized consultation. Figure 38 shows the number of new, follow-up, and total cases for FY 2019 and FY 2020.

Figure 38: Number of Cases, FY 2018-FY 2020

EAFC CASES	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	3-YR AVERAGE
NEW CASES	51	54	43	49
FOLLOW-UP CASES	3	4	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>52</b>

Source: Elder Abuse Forensic Center

### Community-Based Programs

The Department on the Status of Women provides funding through the Violence Against Women (VAW) grant program to community-based organizations to support survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking.

Figure 39: Number of Clients Aged 65+ Served by Gender-Based Violence Funded Programs, FY 2018-FY 2020

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE CLIENTS 65+	FY 2018 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	3-YR AVG (% OF TOTAL)
FEMALE	383 (73%)	402 (73%)	379 (62%)	388 (69%)
MALE	140 (27%)	141 (26%)	188 (31%)	156 (28%)
TRANSGENDER	1 (0.2%)	5 (1%)	45 (7%)	17 (3%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>524 (100%)</b>	<b>548 (100%)</b>	<b>612 (100%)</b>	<b>561 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women


## Perpetrators

The following charts are derived from the Police Department which provides demographic data on elder abuse suspects, including race/ethnicity, gender, and age, and the Elder Abuse Forensic Center which collects data on the relationship between perpetrators and victims.

### Race/Ethnicity

Figure 40 shows the race/ethnicity of elder abuse suspects. Black individuals are disproportionately represented among suspects. Please refer to the note about disproportionate representation of people of color in the criminal justice system in the report's introduction.

Figure 40: Race/Ethnicity of Elder Abuse Suspects Compared to General SF Population,<sup>30</sup> FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department



**68%**

of suspects are male

### Gender

Figure 41 shows the gender of elder abuse suspects. Men were more likely to be perpetrators of elder abuse in FY 2020, representing 68% of the total suspects. This follows trends from previous years.

<sup>30</sup> Source for general San Francisco population by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentages are estimates and include all adults and children in San Francisco City.

Figure 41: Gender of Elder Abuse Suspects, FY 2019-FY 2020

GENDER OF SUSPECT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
MALE	419 (64%)	397 (68%)	-5%
FEMALE	186 (29%)	142 (24%)	-24%
GENDERQUEER/GENDER NON-BINARY	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	
GENDER INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE (NOT COLLECTED, NOT LISTED, DECLINED/NOT STATED)	46 (7%)	46 (8%)	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>651 (100%)</b>	<b>586 (100%)</b>	<b>-10%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

### Age

Figure 42 provides a breakdown by age of elder abuse suspects. From this data, it does not appear that there is one particular age range that is significantly more likely to be a perpetrator. This follows trends from previous years.

Figure 42: Age of Elder Abuse Suspects, FY 2019-FY 2020

AGE OF SUSPECT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
UNDER-18	16 (2%)	9 (2%)	-44%
18-29	73 (11%)	31 (5%)	-58%
30-39	64 (10%)	76 (13%)	19%
40-49	76 (12%)	74 (13%)	-3%
50-59	83 (13%)	70 (12%)	-16%
60+	53 (8%)	73 (12%)	38%
UNKNOWN	286 (44%)	253 (43%)	-12%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>651 (100%)</b>	<b>586 (100%)</b>	<b>-10%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

### Relationship to Victim

The Elder Abuse Forensic Center collects data on the relationship between perpetrators and victims, represented in Figure 43. In FY 2020, 86% of victims knew the perpetrator. Additionally, in many cases, victims were abused by a family member (43% of victims were abused by a family member in FY 2020).



Figure 43: Cases of Abuse by Others, Relationship to Perpetrator, FY 2019-FY 2020

RELATIONSHIP TO PERPETRATOR	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
PERPETRATOR KNOWN TO VICTIM	30 (88%)	24 (86%)	-20%
PERPETRATOR UNKNOWN TO VICTIM	4 (12%)	4 (14%)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34 (100%)</b>	<b>28 (100%)</b>	<b>-18%</b>

Source: Elder Abuse Forensic Center

## Services Available for Perpetrators



### Resolve to Stop the Violence Project

The Sheriff's Department's Resolve to Stop the Violence Project aims to reduce recidivism among violent offenders and restore individuals and communities through community support. There were 7 male participants with elder abuse charges in each FY 2019 and FY 2020.

## Chapter 3: Domestic Violence

Domestic violence, or intimate partner violence, is a pattern of behavior whereby one person in an intimate relationship (married, domestic partners, dating or used to date, live or lived together, and/or have a child together) seeks to control the other through violence, coercion, intimidation or threats. Abuse may take the form of physical abuse, sexual assault, intimidation or threats, and behavior that includes harassing and stalking. Abuse does not need to be physical; abuse can be verbal, emotional, psychological, or financial abuse, and victims may experience multiple forms of abuse.

### Impacts of Domestic Violence

Approximately 41% of female domestic violence survivors and 14% of male domestic violence survivors experience some form of physical injury. In the most severe cases, domestic violence can lead to death. Data from national crime reporting suggests that 1 in 6 homicide victims are killed by an intimate partner, and nearly half of female homicide victims are killed by a current or former male intimate partner.

Beyond physical injury, there are many other negative health outcomes associated with domestic violence, ranging from conditions that affect the heart, digestive, reproductive, and nervous systems, muscles, and bones. Many of these conditions may be chronic in nature. Survivors of domestic violence may also experience lasting mental health issues, including depression and post-traumatic stress disorder. There is also an increased risk of survivors engaging in riskier health behaviors such as smoking, binge drinking, and sexual risk behaviors.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that the lifetime economic cost associated with medical services for domestic violence-related injuries, lost productivity from paid work, criminal justice and other costs, was \$3.6 trillion. The cost of intimate partner violence over a victim's lifetime was \$103,767 for women and \$23,414 for men.<sup>31</sup>

**33%** of women  
in California are estimated to have  
experienced intimate partner physical  
violence, sexual violence, or stalking in their  
lifetime

**27%** of men  
in California are estimated to have  
experienced intimate partner physical  
violence, sexual violence, or stalking in their  
lifetime

---

<sup>31</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Preventing Intimate Partner Violence*, 2020.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/fastfact.html>

## National and State Prevalence of Domestic Violence

The CDC estimates that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 10 men have experienced contact sexual violence, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner during their lifetime. Over 43 million women and 38 million men experienced psychological aggression by an intimate partner in their lifetime.<sup>32</sup> In California, it is estimated that 33% of women and 27% of men experience intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, or stalking in their lifetimes.<sup>33</sup>

## Data Sources

The data in this chapter was provided by the following City and County of San Francisco agencies:

- Adult Probation Department
- Department of Emergency Management
- District Attorney's Office
- Department of Public Health
- Police Department
- Sheriff's Department
- 27 community-based organizations

## Prevalence

Given that domestic violence is often underreported, it is difficult to assess the full extent to which San Franciscans experience domestic violence. According to the National Crime Victimization Survey administered by the U.S. Department of Justice, less than half (47%) of domestic violence cases were reported in 2017.<sup>34</sup> The Figure below provides some measures of where victims seek support when they experience domestic violence in San Francisco: seeking services with community-based organizations, calling 911, and calling domestic violence crisis lines.



## 911 Calls

One measure of the prevalence of domestic violence is the number of calls to the Department of Emergency Management. Calls are broken down by type in Figure 44. There were 7,110 911 calls related

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, *Domestic Violence in California*, 2019.

[https://assets.speakcdn.com/assets/2497/california\\_2019.pdf](https://assets.speakcdn.com/assets/2497/california_2019.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> Rachel E. Morgan, Jennifer L. Truman, *Criminal Victimization*, 2017, 2018. <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv17.pdf>

to domestic violence in FY 2019 and 7,241 calls in FY 2020, representing a 2% increase overall. The most prevalent type of call concerned a fight or dispute where no weapons were used, representing over half of all calls in FY 2019 and FY 2020. The next most prevalent type of call concerned assault and battery, representing approximately a third of calls in both years. Domestic Violence Stalking calls increased by 90% between FY 2019 and FY 2020.

Figure 44: 911 Calls Related to Domestic Violence, FY 2018-FY 2020

TYPE	DESCRIPTION	FY 2018 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	3-YR AVG (% OF TOTAL)
418DV	Fight or Dispute – No Weapons Used	4,030 (52%)	3,810 (54%)	4,019 (56%)	3,953 (54%)
240DV	Assault/Battery (Includes Unwanted Physical Contact)	2,542 (33%)	2,248 (32%)	2,134 (29%)	2,302 (31%)
646	Stalking	409 (5%)	294 (4%)	317 (4%)	340 (5%)
650DV	Threats (Written, Verbal, or Recorded)	281 (4%)	294 (4%)	277 (4%)	284 (4%)
594DV	Malicious Mischief/Vandalism (Property Damage Only)	130 (2%)	116 (2%)	140 (2%)	129 (2%)
602DV	Break-In	40 (1%)	55 (1%)	64 (1%)	53 (1%)
245DV	Aggravated Assault (Severe Injuries or Objects Used to Injure)	102 (1%)	100 (1%)	85 (1%)	96 (1%)
222DV	Armed Assailant – Knife	61 (1%)	73 (1%)	81 (1%)	72 (1%)
416DV	Civil Standby (Officer Takes a Person to Retrieve Belongings)	16 (0.2%)	17 (0.2%)	16 (0.2%)	16 (0.2%)
646DV	Domestic Violence Stalking	36 (0.5%)	20 (0.3%)	38 (1%)	31 (0.4%)
419DV	Fight or Dispute – Weapons Used	29 (0.4%)	27 (0.4%)	20 (0.3%)	25 (0.3%)
219DV	Stabbing	13 (0.2%)	10 (0.1%)	9 (0.1%)	11 (0.1%)
221DV	Armed Assailant – Gun	16 (0.2%)	23 (0.3%)	19 (0.3%)	19 (0.3%)
910DV	Well-Being Check (Often at the Request of Another Individual)	19 (0.2%)	23 (0.3%)	22 (0.3%)	21 (0.3%)
<b>TOTAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE &amp; STALKING CALLS</b>		<b>7,706 (100%)</b>	<b>7,110 (100%)</b>	<b>7,241 (100%)</b>	<b>7,352 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Department of Emergency Management

Figure 45 provides data on the number of translation requests for incoming domestic violence calls. Spanish was the most requested language, representing 73% of requests in FY 2020. Other languages requested in either FY 2019 or FY 2020 include Mandarin, Vietnamese, Arabic, Burmese, French, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Farsi, Mongolian, Sign Language, Tagalog, and Thai.

*Figure 45: Translation Requests for Incoming Domestic Violence Calls, FY 2019-FY 2020*

BY LANGUAGE	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
SPANISH	240 (75%)	255 (73%)	6%
CANTONESE	36 (11%)	27 (8%)	-25%
PORTUGUESE	0 (0%)	15 (4%)	100%
ALL OTHER LANGUAGES	28 (9%)	30 (9%)	7%
UNIDENTIFIED	18 (6%)	20 (6%)	11%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>322 (100%)</b>	<b>347 (100%)</b>	<b>8%</b>

Source: San Francisco Department of Emergency Management



**77%**  
of suspects in incidents where a weapon was used were male

### Weapon Use

As noted above, there have been increases in 911 calls related to armed assailants with a knife. Data from the Police Department also provides insight into the number of domestic violence incidents where a weapon was used. Figure 46 provides a breakdown by gender of the suspect, and Figure 47 provides a breakdown by gender of the victim. Of suspects, men represent approximately 77% of suspects in incidents where a weapon was used, and women represent 69% of victims in FY 2020. This follows trends from previous years.

*Figure 46: Domestic Violence Incidents where Weapon was Used by Gender of Suspect, FY 2019-FY 2020*

GENDER OF SUSPECT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	%CHANGE
MALE	2,610 (81%)	2,188 (77%)	-16%
FEMALE	600 (19%)	606 (21%)	1%
GENDERQUEER/GENDER NON-BINARY	0 (0%)	3 (0.1%)	
GENDER INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE (NOT COLLECTED, DECLINED/NOT STATED)	20 (1%)	30 (1%)	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,230 (100%)</b>	<b>2,827 (100%)</b>	<b>-12%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

Figure 47: Domestic Violence Incidents where Weapon was Used by Gender of Victim, FY 2019-FY 2020

GENDER OF VICTIM	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	%CHANGE
MALE	916 (26%)	917 (29%)	0%
FEMALE	2,605 (73%)	2,178 (69%)	-16%
GENDER INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE (NOT COLLECTED, DECLINED/NOT STATED)	60 (2%)	51 (2%)	-15%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,581 (100%)</b>	<b>3,146 (100%)</b>	<b>-12%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department



### Proposition 63 & Firearms Surrender Program

Proposition 63 is a safety for all initiative designed to keep guns and ammunition out of the hands of violent offenders. The law requires defendants to relinquish all firearms in their possession and/or control upon conviction. The San Francisco Adult Probation Department Proposition 63 Unit investigates and informs the Courts if the defendant owns firearms and if those firearms have been relinquished. In FY 2018-2019, pursuant to the Penal Code Section 29810, the San Francisco Adult Probation Department Prop 63 Unit

received 2318 PPRF referrals from the Courts and identified 55 firearms through the PPRF Process.

Beginning in November 2018, the Sheriff's Department has also begun an effort to track, investigate, and enforce prohibitions on firearm possession by individuals who have a Domestic Violence Restraining Order or Criminal Protective Order issued against them. Between November 2018 and October 2019, the Sheriff's Department received 351 domestic violence temporary restraining orders and served 218 (62%). The total number of temporary restraining orders during this time period was 979, indicating that the Sheriff's Department received 36% of total restraining orders. In this same period, there were 29 firearms registered to restrained parties; the Sheriff's Department seized nine firearms and the remaining 20 firearms were surrendered. In FY 2020, the Sheriff's Department seized 17 firearms and six firearms were surrendered. The San Francisco Sheriff's Office Civil Section received a total of 279 cases requesting a Domestic Violence Temporary Restraining Order (DVTRO) and successfully served DVTRO's in 107 (38% of) cases in FY 2020.

### Guns and Domestic Violence

There is a close and dangerous link between guns and domestic violence.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Everytown for Gun Safety, *Guns and Violence Against Women: America's Uniquely Lethal Intimate Partner Violence Problem*, 2019. <https://everytownresearch.org/reports/guns-intimate-partner-violence/>



**17**

firearms restrained by  
the Sheriff's  
Department  
(FY 2020)

- The presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation increases risk of homicide by 500%.<sup>36</sup>
- It is estimated that over half of female victims of intimate partner homicides in the U.S. are killed with a gun, leading to approximately 52 women shot and killed each month.
- A person using abuse with a gun can further inflict emotional abuse and exert control over their victims. Nearly 1 million women alive today have reported being shot or shot at by intimate partners, and 4.5 million women have reported being threatened with a gun.
- In two-thirds of domestic violence homicide situations with a gun, it is not uncommon for the person using abuse to also die by firearm suicide.
- In FY 2020, the San Francisco Sheriff's Department restrained party owned firearms in 17 cases and firearms were surrendered to the Sheriff's Office in six cases.

### Homicide

The Police Department provides data on homicides where domestic violence was a contributing circumstance. Figure 48 provides a breakdown of all homicides in CY 2019 and CY 2020. Of the 41 homicides in CY 2019, three were related to domestic violence and none were related to family violence. In CY 2020, two homicides were related to domestic violence and one was related to family violence. Figure 49 provides details about the demographics of homicide victims.

*Figure 48: San Francisco Homicides by Contributing Circumstance, CY 2019-CY 2020*

CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCE	CY 2019	CY 2020
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	3	2
FAMILY VIOLENCE	0	1
OTHER MOTIVES	38	45
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>48</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

*Figure 49: Domestic Violence and Family Violence Homicide Victims, CY 2019-CY 2020*

YEAR	RELATIONSHIP TO SUSPECT	VICTIM RACE AND GENDER	VICTIM AGE
2019	Girlfriend	Hispanic Female	63
2019	Girlfriend	Hispanic Female	21
2019	Boyfriend	White Male	41
2020	Mother	Hispanic Female	56
2020	Boyfriend	Black Male	58
2020	Wife	Asian Female	68

Source: San Francisco Police Department

<sup>36</sup> Heather, *Safety Planning Around Guns and Firearms*. <https://www.thehotline.org/resources/safety-planning-around-guns-and-firearms/>


There were additional homicides in 2019 and 2020 that are suspected to be domestic violence related but were not coded by the Police Department as such. Based on reports by the media, Figure 50 provides information about these suspected domestic violence related homicides.

Figure 50: Suspected Domestic Violence Related Homicides, FY 2019-FY 2020

YEAR	RELATIONSHIP TO SUSPECT	VICTIM RACE AND GENDER	VICTIM AGE
2019 <sup>37</sup>	Bystander	Female, Race not known	61
2019 <sup>38</sup>	Girlfriend	Native American Female	35
2020 <sup>39</sup>	Boyfriend	Male, Race not known	26

Figure 51 shows the number of domestic violence homicides with female victims reported by the San Francisco Police Department over the last 29 years. While there has been a significant reduction in homicides since the early 1990s, there has been an increase in homicides where domestic violence was a contributing circumstance since 2014. Note that data received from the Police Department only includes historical data for female victims of domestic violence homicides.

Figure 51: Domestic Violence Homicides with Female Victims, CY 1991-CY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department

<sup>37</sup> Sernoffsky, Evan, "Woman killed filming attack in Tenderloin—becomes year's first homicide," Jan. 3, 2019, <https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/Woman-61-killed-in-SF-s-Tenderloin-is-13506480.php?psid=3vEMS>

<sup>38</sup> Barba, Michael, "Family Suspects foul play in death of woman investigated as apparent suicide," April 17, 2019, <https://www.sfxaminer.com/the-city/family-suspects-foul-play-in-death-of-woman-investigated-as-apparent-suicide/>

<sup>39</sup> Barba, Michael, "Murder-Suicide at Union Square hotel investigated as domestic violence," March 30, 2020, <https://www.sfxaminer.com/news/murder-suicide-at-union-square-hotel-investigated-as-domestic-violence/>





### Domestic Violence Death Review Team

California Penal Code section 11163.3(a) authorizes the creation of the Domestic Violence Death Review Team (“DVDRT”) to assist local agencies in identifying and reviewing domestic violence deaths, including homicides and suicides, and facilitating communication among the various agencies involved in domestic violence cases in order to review incidents and design recommendations for policies and protocols to reduce the incidence of domestic violence.


It has been a recurring recommendation of the Family Violence Council to re-establish the San Francisco DVDRT. In 2019, the Department on the Status of Women and the District Attorney’s Office held a series of planning meetings with member agencies of the Domestic Violence Death Review Team. The Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice provided technical assistance to this effort through the national Sentinel Event Initiative. The first case is currently under review; recommendations will be shared with the Council in 2021.

### System Response



After the Police Department responds to 911 calls, arrests may be made, and a subset of cases are further investigated by the Police Department’s Special Victims Unit. Figure 52 provides an overview of the system flow of cases in FY 2019 and FY 2020. In FY 2020, Police responded to 3,379 incidents.


Figure 52: System Response to Domestic Violence Cases, FY 2019-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department

Figure 53 shows the number of incidents responded to by police officers and arrests made over the last six years, from FY 2015 to FY 2020. The number of arrests made has remained relatively steady over the years, with arrests made at 54% of incidents responded to.


Figure 53: Incidents Responded to by Police Officers and Arrests, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department

The Police Department also provides data about incidents related to stalking. Police responded to 162 incidents in FY 2019 and 135 incidents in FY 2020, representing a 17% decrease.

Figure 54: System Response to Stalking Cases, FY 2019-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department




**17%**

Decrease in prosecution rate (FY 2020)

### Prosecution

Data from the District Attorney’s Office provides information about cases that are received and prosecuted. Figure 55 summarizes this information for domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuse. There has been a decrease of 32% of the number of cases filed from those received between FY 2019 and FY 2020. The total prosecution rate has decreased by 10%. The number of cases that are referred for probation/mandatory supervision/parole violation has remained relatively stable. Figure 56 shows the number of domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuse cases that the District Attorney’s Office received and the percentage of cases that were ultimately prosecuted over the last six years, from FY 2015 to FY 2020.

Figure 55: Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Elder Abuse Cases Received and Prosecutions, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco District Attorney’s Office

Figure 56: Filing Statistics for Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Elder Abuse by Action Type FY 2019-FY 2020

FILING STATISTICS FOR DV, STALKING, ELDER ABUSE	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
CASES RECEIVED	1,852	1,587	-14%
CASES FILED	656	443	-32%
FILING RATE	35%	28%	-21%
CASES REFERRED FOR PROBATION/MANDATORY SUPERVISION	104	100	-4%
TOTAL DA ACTIONS TAKEN (FILING AND OTHER ACTION)	760	543	-29%
TOTAL DA ACTION RATE	41%	34%	-17%

Source: San Francisco District Attorney’s Office



cases resolved through jury trial in FY 2020

### Convictions

Figure 57 provides information about domestic violence, stalking, and elder abuse cases that are resolved at trial as reported by the District Attorney. In FY 2019, 36 domestic violence cases were resolved through jury trial. In FY 2020, 8 domestic violence cases were resolved through jury trial, representing a 78% decrease. Due to the COVID-9 pandemic, the number of jury trials decreased sharply after early March 2020, and for many months no jury trials were conducted at all in San Francisco county. This helps to explain the sharp decrease in number of jury trials conducted in FY 2020 compared to FY 2019. This decrease in jury trials is not unique to domestic violence cases but applies to all types of criminal and civil jury trials statewide. In FY 2019, 32 of 36 domestic violence jury trials (including domestic violence, stalking, and elder

abuse) resulted in a conviction on at least one count. In FY 2020, 7 of 8 domestic violence jury trials resulted in a conviction on at least one count. The number of cases that are resolved outside of court (*e.g.*, where a plea bargain was entered) are not tracked by the court system. Furthermore, the penal code does not make clear whether an allegation is stalking, elder abuse, or domestic violence, so the convictions can only be shared for stalking, elder abuse and domestic violence combined. In future reports, the Family Violence Council will work to compile data from both the District Attorney’s Office and the Public Defender’s Office to provide a more complete picture of convictions.

Figure 57: Cases Tried for Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Elder Abuse, FY 2018-FY 2020

CASES TRIED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	3-YEAR AVERAGE
TOTAL TRIALS	17	36	8	20
TOTAL TRIAL CONVICTIONS	14	32	7	18

Source: San Francisco District Attorney’s Office



825

requests for DV restraining orders in FY 2020

### Restraining Orders

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 includes in-laws but not cousins. Most 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. San Francisco Unified Family Court remained open during the pandemic and continued issuing restraining orders

and holding hearings. The Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic, a Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Prevention and Intervention Grant Program recipient, noted that “we have had to prepare clients to appear in person under a host of health and safety measures or to appear at the hearing over the telephone, which is *not ideal* and requires a much longer time for adequate preparation.” There are several dispositions possible at the hearing as follows.

- **Granted:** The petitioner receives a restraining order. Domestic Violence restraining orders issued by a Family Court may be issued for up to five years and are renewable permanently or for five more years.
- **Denied:** The petitioner does not receive a permanent restraining order, and the temporary order is removed.
- **Off-Calendar:** A case may be removed from the calendar if the petitioner does not attend the hearing, or if the petitioner indicates that he or she no longer wants the restraining order.
- **Pending:** A case may not have been resolved by the close of the fiscal year, June 30.
- **Continued:** The most common reason for a continuance, or a rescheduling of the hearing, is the inability to find and serve the respondent with the order prior to the hearing date.
- **Dismissal:** The judge may determine the case should be dismissed, or it could be dismissed at the request of the petitioner.
- **Set for Trial:** Instead of a short hearing, some restraining order requests require a trial to determine a disposition.

The Family Law Division of the San Francisco Superior Court received 825 requests for domestic violence restraining orders in FY 2020. The number of requests received in FY 2020 is below the previous 3-year average of 1,008 requests. Of the requests in FY 2020, 292 were granted. 74% of requests granted remained on the calendar in FY 2020.

*Figure 58: Civil Domestic Violence Restraining Order Requests, FY 2018-FY 2020*

STATUS OF RESTRAINING ORDER	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	3 YEAR AVERAGE
REQUESTS*	1,110	1,089	825	1,008
OFF CALENDAR	594	560	432	529
GRANTED	346	302	292	313
% GRANTED THAT REMAIN ON CALENDAR	67%	57%	74%	66%
DENIED	84	86	43	71
OTHER DISPOSITIONS**	176	168	170	171
PENDING	0	2	2	1
*THE INFORMATION IN THIS TABLE DOES NOT INCLUDE RESTRAINING ORDER REQUESTED IN CRIMINAL COURT AS PART OF A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION.				
**OTHER DISPOSITION INCLUDES CASES CONTINUED PER REISSUANCE OF ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE, DISMISSED, SET FOR TRIAL, ADVANCED, OR VACATED.				

Source: San Francisco Superior Court

For restraining orders that are granted, the respondent must relinquish any firearms by surrendering it immediately upon request of any law enforcement officer, or within 24 hours if no request is made. The person must file a receipt demonstrating proof that the firearm has been surrendered within 48 hours of being served with the order.

In addition to domestic violence restraining orders, individuals may also request a Gun Violence Restraining Order (GVRO), which prohibits someone from having a gun, ammunition, or magazines. Only


a close family member or a law enforcement officer can request a GVRO. Close family members include: a spouse or domestic partner; parents, children, siblings, grandparents, grandchildren and their spouses (including stepparents or step-grandparents); a spouse’s parents, children, siblings, grandparents and grandchildren; any person who regularly lives in the individual’s house within the last 6 months.

## Demographics of Victims

### Race/Ethnicity

Figure 59 provides the breakdown of domestic violence victims from the Police Department by race/ethnicity in FY 2020 compared to the general San Francisco population. Black/African American and Latino/a/x victims are overrepresented compared to their share of the general San Francisco Population.

Figure 59: Race/Ethnicity of Victim Compared to General SF Population,<sup>40</sup> FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Police Department

<sup>40</sup> Source for general San Francisco population by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentage includes all adults and children in San Francisco.

## Languages Spoken

Of the 10,173 individuals served in FY 2020 by the Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Intervention (GBV) Grants Program, 3,689 individuals (36%) spoke a language other than English. Figure 60 presents the most frequently spoken languages.

Figure 60: Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Grant-Funded Programs: Languages Spoken, FY 2020

LANGUAGES SPOKEN	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
SPANISH	1,461 (53%)	1,546 (42%)	6%
LAOTIAN	370 (13%)	864 (23%)	134%
CAMBODIAN	291 (11%)	329 (9%)	13%
CANTONESE	283 (9%)	287 (8%)	1%
OTHER	125 (5%)	125 (3%)	0%
ARABIC	42 (2%)	40 (1%)	-5%
SAMOAN	42 (2%)	*	
MONGOLIAN	*	39 (1%)	
MANDARIN	45 (2%)	69 (2%)	53%
CHINESE (OTHER DIALECTS)	52 (2%)	131 (4%)	152%
VIETNAMESE	41 (1%)	25 (1%)	-39%
THAI	40 (1%)	234 (6%)	485%
<b>TOTAL NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS (%)</b>	<b>2,747 (100%)</b>	<b>3,689 (100%)</b>	<b>34%</b>

\* LESS THAN 1% OF TOTAL. INCLUDED IN 'OTHER' FOR THAT YEAR.

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women



### Gender

**70%**

of victims are female

Domestic violence disproportionately impacts women. In instances where gender data is available, female victims made up 73% in FY 2019 and 70% in FY 2020.

Figure 61: Gender of Domestic Violence Victim, FY 2020

GENDER OF VICTIM	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
FEMALE	3,392 (73%)	2,911 (70%)	-14%
MALE	1,185 (25%)	1,166 (28%)	-2%
GENDER INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE (NOT COLLECTED, DECLINED/NOT STATED)	77 (2%)	83 (2%)	8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,654 (100%)</b>	<b>4,160 (100%)</b>	<b>-11%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

Figure 62: Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Grant-Funded Programs: Gender of Client Where Known, FY 2020

GENDER OF VICTIM	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
FEMALE	9,995 (72%)	9,565 (66%)	-4%
MALE	3,091 (22%)	3,392 (23%)	10%
TRANSGENDER	758 (5%)	1,544 (11%)	104%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,804 (100%)</b>	<b>14,501 (100%)</b>	<b>5%</b>

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

## Age

Victims between the ages of 18 and 39 years of age represent over half of victims (53% of total victims in FY 2019 and 54% of total victims in FY 2020).

Figure 63: Age of Domestic Violence Victim, FY 2019-FY 2020

AGE OF VICTIM	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
UNDER-18	587 (13%)	510 (12%)	-13%
18-29	1,262 (27%)	1,074 (26%)	-15%
30-39	1,222 (26%)	1,168 (28%)	-4%
40-49	838 (18%)	712 (17%)	-15%
50-59	427 (9%)	383 (9%)	-10%
60+	211 (5%)	211 (5%)	0%
UNKNOWN	108 (2%)	102 (2%)	-6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,655 (100%)</b>	<b>4,160 (100%)</b>	<b>-11%</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department



Figure 64: Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Grant-Funded Programs: Age of Client (Where Known), FY 2019-FY 2020

AGE OF CLIENT	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
UNDER-18	2,390 (17%)	2,564 (18%)	7%
18-24	1,830 (13%)	2,026 (14%)	11%
25-64	9,076 (66%)	9,299 (64%)	2%
65+	548 (4%)	612 (4%)	12%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,844 (100%)</b>	<b>14,501 (100%)</b>	<b>5%</b>


Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

### Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Many agencies do not yet consistently collect information on the sexual orientation and gender identity of victims who experience domestic violence. Based on data collected by organizations funded by the Gender-Based Violence Grants Program of the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, 6% of clients served in FY 2019 and 4% of clients served in FY 2020 identified as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Questioning, Other.


The Youth Risk Behavior Survey, conducted by the San Francisco Unified School’s District in partnership with the Centers for Disease Control, gives insight into the sexual orientation of students who experience physical and sexual dating violence. This survey was most recently conducted in School Year (SY) 2019. In both SY 2018 and SY 2019, the survey found that high school students who identify as Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual were more likely to have experienced violence, as seen in Figure 65 and Figure 66. Due to the low unweighted sample size, results for transgender students are not likely representative and therefore not included.

Figure 65: Youth Risk Behavior Survey: % of Students Who Experienced Physical Dating Violence, SY 2018-SY 2019



Source: San Francisco Unified School’s District

Figure 66: Youth Risk Behavior Survey: % of Students Who Experienced Sexual Dating Violence, SY 2018-SY 2019



Source: San Francisco Unified School’s District

### Services Available for Survivors

See Appendix B for a full description of the services available to survivors and perpetrators.

#### Community-Based Services

San Francisco is served by a network of community-based organizations which provide six types of core services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual violence and human trafficking:



Crisis lines



Legal and advocacy services



Emergency shelter



Counseling



Transitional housing



Prevention and education



Each year, the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) distributes grants to fund community-based organizations through the Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Prevention and Intervention Grants Program (formerly the Violence Against Women (VAW) Prevention and Intervention Grants program). In FY 2019, these funds supported 39 community-based programs, in FY 2020 this has increased to 41 community-based programs. Figure 67 provides a high-level summary of the total grant dollars, number of individuals supported, and hours of support provided.

There was a 5% increase in the number of dollars provided to community-based organizations and a 47% increase in the total number of hours of support. However, there was a 45% decrease in the number of individuals served. Providing a full range of services to survivors of domestic violence is expensive in nature and it is important to note that survivors may access services from multiple agencies and spend a significant length of time with community-based organizations.

Figure 67: Community-Based Organizations: Summary Report, FY 2019-FY 2020

COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
DOSW 5847	\$ 8,166,570	\$ 8,584,767	5%
INDIVIDUALS SERVED	18,481	14,501	-22%
HOURS OF SUPPORT	33,685	49,589	47%

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women



**11,829**

Calls to crisis lines in FY 2020

### Crisis Line Calls

San Francisco is served by five crisis lines that support victims of domestic violence, sexual violence and human trafficking, two of which are funded by the VAW Grant Program, administered by the Department on the Status of Women. These hotlines are free and confidential, and provide phone counseling, safety planning and referrals. The number of crisis line calls in FY 2019 was 8,647 and 11,829 in FY 2020. Survivors may be accessing resources elsewhere, such as online or through other national or other hotlines or texting lines.

### Domestic Violence Information and Referral Center

In addition to the five crisis lines that support survivors of domestic violence, the Domestic Violence Information and Referral Center (DVIRC) serves as an online interactive network that provides a safe space for member domestic violence service providers to share, network, and access updated information on services available in the Bay Area. The DVIRC was created in 2012 as a collaborative effort between domestic violence agencies in the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties. Figure 68 provides information about the number of organizations active and number of shelter and program searches. It is estimated that approximately 9%\* of searches come from San Francisco-based organizations. In 2020, the number of active organizations has increased to 73 members. This increase included adding several southern California-based organizations as members of the DVIRC. This has

impacted the percentage of searches that come from San Francisco based organizations as there is more usage in southern California.

\*Represents member usage of the DVIRC while they are in San Francisco. This is likely an underrepresentation as some San Francisco-based volunteers reside outside San Francisco.

Figure 68: Member Organizations, Shelter Referrals, and Program Searches, FY 2019-FY 2020

DVIRC	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
ORGANIZATIONS ACTIVE	69	73	6%
NUMBER OF DV SHELTER REFERRALS	43,455	93,159	114%
NUMBER OF PROGRAM SEARCHES	1,914	2,446	28%
OTHER SEARCHES	12,109	37,025	206%
<b>TOTAL SEARCHES</b>	<b>57,478</b>	<b>132,630</b>	<b>131%</b>

Source: Domestic Violence Information and Referral Center



### Emergency Shelter

Emergency shelter services provide intensive, short-term support, intended to give survivors and their children time and space to consider their options in safety. San Francisco is served by three domestic violence shelters: Asian Women’s Shelter, La Casa de las Madres, and the Riley Center at St. Vincent de Paul Society. Figure 69 provides data on bed nights provided, clients served, and the number of individuals turned away. These data reflect

the organizations’ entire programs, not just the VAW Grant funded portions. The three shelters have been serving approximately 500 women and children each year. The turn away rate remains steady: 78% and 79% of individuals seeking shelter were turned away in FY 2019 and FY 2020, respectively. Reasons for turn away include lack of bed space, the shelter is not in a safe location for the survivor, the shelter was unable to accommodate the survivor’s needs (e.g., substance use disorder, mental health needs, language needs), the shelter was unable to accommodate the survivor’s children, and/or the survivor did not want to go into shelter. Further, La Casa de las Madres noted that the primary reason for turn away, representing over 60% of callers seeking shelter, is because callers are not experiencing domestic violence.

Figure 69: Emergency Shelter Bed Nights Provided and Turn Away Rates, FY 2019-FY 2020

EMERGENCY SHELTER	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
CLIENTS SERVED	475	532	12%
TURNED AWAY	1,653	1,975	19%
TURN AWAY RATE	78%	79%	1%

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

## Shelter-in-Place Hotel and Site 47

The City and County of San Francisco and (CCSF) activated its COVID-19 Command Center (CCC) amidst the COVID-19 pandemic to respond quickly and effectively to the pandemic. The CCC oversees a COVID-19 Alternative Housing System as part of its pandemic response, including the Shelter-in-Place (SIP) Hotel Program. The SIP Hotel Program primarily supports individuals experiencing homelessness in San Francisco in complying with the shelter in place order.

In September 2020, the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) and the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI) partnered with the City's CCC to create and support a confidential referral process to a Shelter in Place (SIP) Hotel for adult women fleeing gender-based violence. In addition to SIP Hotel eligibility, 20 hotel rooms have been dedicated to referrals for cisgender, transgender, and queer adult women ages 18 and older fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence. The program does not accept youth (ages 0-17) and cisgender, transgender, or queer men, including as roommates. All 20 rooms were filled by early December 2020. However, there is a continued need to serve this population, with a total of 44 additional referrals received as of December 14, 2020.



### Transitional and Permanent Housing

The GBV Grants Program funds two transitional housing agencies in San Francisco – Saint Vincent de Paul's Gum Moon Women's Residence and Brennan House, and San Francisco SafeHouse – and one permanent housing program, at Mary Elizabeth Inn. These services provide longer-term stability to survivors of abuse and their families.

In FY 2018, VAW Partner Agencies provided 18,029 transitional housing bed nights to women and their children. In FY 2019, there were 20,017 bed nights provided. In FY 2020, 22,176 beds were provided, representing an 11% increase from the previous year. In FY 2020, 709 women and children were turned away from transitional housing compared to 288 in FY 2019, more than double the previous year. The turn away rate increased from 1% in FY 2019 to 3% in FY 2020. Those turned away will often receive placement referrals to sometimes distant facilities in other counties.

*Figure 70: Transitional Shelter Bed Nights Provided and Turn Away Rates, FY 2019-FY 2020*


TRANSITIONAL SHELTER	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
BED NIGHTS PROVIDED	20,017	22,176	11%
TURNED AWAY	288	709	146%
TURN AWAY RATE	1%	3%	200%

Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

### Counseling and Advocacy

Community-based organizations also provide counseling, casework, and advocacy to survivors. Figure 71 shows the number of hours of counseling, including individual and group counseling, and hours of case management provided.

Figure 71: Hours of Counseling and Case Management Provided to Clients, FY 2017-FY 2020




Source: San Francisco Department on the Status of Women

### Survivor Restoration Program

The Survivor Restoration Project, which is managed by the Sheriff’s Department, offers direct services to the survivors of the offenders participating in Resolve to Stop the Violence (RSVP). Figure 72 shows the number of new and ongoing clients in the Survivor Restoration Program. From FY 2018 to FY 2019, there was another 11% reduction in the total number of clients (1,558 to 1,391). Between FY 2019 and FY 2020, there was a 25% reduction in the total number of clients (1,391 to 1,047 clients). Figure 73 shows some of the outcomes achieved for clients.

Figure 72: Survivor Restoration Program: New and Ongoing Clients, FY 2015-FY 2020



Source: San Francisco Sheriff’s Department

Figure 73: Survivor Restoration Program: Outcomes, FY 2020

SRP OUTCOMES	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	3-YR AVG
TOTAL U-VISAS FILED	37	28	23	29
POLITICAL ASYLUM GRANTED	3	4	3	3
PERMANENT RESIDENCE GRANTED	30	28	22	27
GRADUATED FROM EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM	38	28	48	38

Source: San Francisco Sheriff's Department



### Health Care Services

Healthcare providers may be the first or only professionals to encounter and provide services to many victims of family violence. The San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) strives to reduce family violence and other forms of interpersonal violence through public health prevention and programs in the San Francisco Health Network (SFHN) clinics and hospitals.

Although some victims of interpersonal violence may present with obvious injuries during a healthcare visit, it is far more common that they present with only subtle or often unrecognized symptoms of repeated abuse or violence like behavior changes (especially in children), new homelessness, pain, depression, anxiety, or exacerbation of acute and chronic health problems. Preventing and treating and preventing interpersonal violence requires extensive training of healthcare staff, implementation of protocols, and provision of on-site and community resources. Because interpersonal violence is so common and disclosure rates are much lower than the actual prevalence, SFHN training emphasizes how to care for all patients in a healing-centered, trauma-informed way and to provide universal education about the impacts of interpersonal violence on health and how to access appropriate resources; direct screening is also done and screening and disclosure rates are below. There are various legal mandates (local, state, and federal) requiring that healthcare providers and systems address intimate partner violence, child abuse, and elder abuse. The Affordable Care Act mandates that all health insurance plans offer women and girls free interpersonal violence prevention education, screening, brief counseling and referral.



### Emergency Department

The Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG) Emergency Department routinely screens for interpersonal violence in the triage area, where nurses inquire about domestic violence with each patient (unless noted as “not applicable”). Further interpersonal violence screening occurs on a case-by-case basis during the clinical care following triage. All patients identified as, or suspected to be, victims of interpersonal violence are offered treatment, counseling, and referrals to community services.

## Primary Care



Outpatient primary care and women’s clinics in the San Francisco Health Network (SFHN)<sup>41</sup> have a long history of addressing interpersonal violence; an intimate partner violence protocol was endorsed by the San Francisco Health Commission in 1998. Beginning in FY2015, the San Francisco Health Network (SFHN) implemented a federally funded multi-sector, trauma-informed partnership program called ARISE (Aspire to Re-Imagine Safety and Equity), led by a team at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), to improve the health and safety of adults and children affected by interpersonal violence. Through SFHN-UCSF-community-based organization partnerships, patient education, healthcare team training, protocol and policy change, and improved documentation, ARISE has resulted in dramatic increases in the provision of life-saving education to patients about interpersonal violence, trauma and healing and the disclosure of interpersonal violence by SFHN patients. ARISE co-located a domestic violence advocate from La Casa de las Madres (the ARISE IPV Advocate) on the San Francisco General Hospital campus to respond immediately to patients from five outpatient clinics who disclose interpersonal violence. The ARISE IPV Advocate provides SFHN patients with on-site education, emotional support, safety planning, and expedited referrals to support groups and services, counseling, legal assistance, and shelter. The onsite advocate has been off campus since mid-March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic but is still taking direct referrals. Many of the SFHN patients who meet with the ARISE IPV Advocate have never interacted with a community-based domestic violence agency previously.

Figure 74 provides the number of outpatient primary care and women’s clinic clients screened for interpersonal violence by gender. The number of clients screened in FY 2019 and FY 2020 are relatively similar following a dramatic jump in number of clients screened from FY 2018 to FY 2019; the maintenance of screening rates during the COVID19 pandemic is remarkable, especially as the SFHN clinics rapidly transitioned to providing telephone-based care. Overall, between FY 2019 and FY 2020, there has been an increase in the number of clients who disclosed current interpersonal violence (24% increase in females disclosing current IPV and 47% increase in males disclosing current IPV) and a decrease in number of clients disclosing past IPV (44% decrease for females with past IPV and 50% decrease for males with past IPV)

---

<sup>41</sup> Clinics included: Balboa Teen Health Center, Castro-Mission Health Center, Children’s Health Center, Chinatown Public Health Center, Cole Street Youth Clinic, Curry Senior Center, Family Health Center, Larkin Street Youth Clinic, Maxine Hall Health Center, Ocean Park Health Center, Positive Health Program, Potrero Hill Health Center, Richard Fine People’s Clinic, Silver Avenue Family Health Center, Southeast Health Center, Tom Waddell Urban Health Center, and Women’s Health Center.



Figure 74: Outpatient Primary Care and Women's Clinic: Clients Experiencing Interpersonal Violence by Gender, FY 2019-FY 2020

PRIMARY CARE CLIENT STATUS	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
FEMALE CLIENTS SCREENED*	16,119 (59%)	14,159 (58%)	-12%
FEMALE CLIENTS WHO DISCLOSED CURRENT INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE**	579 (2%)	716 (3%)	24%
FEMALE CLIENTS WHO DISCLOSED PAST INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE***	1,043 (4%)	583 (2%)	-44%
MALE CLIENTS SCREENED*	11,072 (41%)	10,213 (42%)	-8%
MALE CLIENTS WHO DISCLOSED CURRENT INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE**	451 (2%)	662 (3%)	47%
MALE CLIENTS WHO DISCLOSED PAST INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE***	659 (2%)	327 (1%)	-50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27,191 (100%)</b>	<b>24,327 (100%)</b>	<b>-10%</b>
*A "screened client" is defined as a client with a completed standardized field in at least one of categories of abuse on a standardized screening tool called the 'behavioral health vital signs'.			
**A client "with current intimate partner violence" is defined as a client with a positive screen in three categories of abuse that occurred within the past 12 months.			
***A client "with past intimate partner violence" is defined as a client with a positive screen for past abuse, in any one of the three categories of abuse, more than one year ago.			

Source: Kimberg L, Bakken EH, Chen E, Schillinger D. The "Behavioral Health Vital Signs" initiative. *NEJM Catalyst*. 2019.

### Trauma Recovery Center

The University of California, San Francisco Trauma Recovery Center (UCSF-TRC) provides mental health and clinical case management services to survivors of interpersonal violence. Figure 75 shows the number of clients served in FY 2020 by trauma type. The most prevalent trauma type experienced by clients served is sexual assault (59% of clients served in FY 2019 and 49% of clients served in FY 2020).

Figure 75: Trauma Recovery Center: Client Statistics by Trauma Type, FY 2020

TRAUMA TYPE	FY 2019 (% OF TOTAL)	FY 2020 (% OF TOTAL)	% CHANGE
SEXUAL ASSAULT	390 (59%)	251 (49%)	-36%
OTHER ASSAULT	222 (34%)	203 (40%)	-9%
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	24 (4%)	29 (6%)	21%
FAMILY OF VICTIM	26 (4%)	25 (5%)	-4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>662 (100%)</b>	<b>508 (100%)</b>	<b>-23%</b>

Source: San Francisco Department of Public Health

## District Attorney’s 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 updates, transportation, resources, referrals, and more. In FY 2019, there were 2,195 individuals supported by the Victim Services Division. Of those, there were 88 children who were witnesses to domestic violence. In FY 2020, there were 2,259 individuals supported by the Victim Services Division. Of those, there were 141 children who were witnesses to domestic violence served.

## Perpetrators

### Race/Ethnicity

The Police Department provides data on the race/ethnicity of domestic violence and stalking suspects. In FY 2019, Black individuals represented 38% of all suspects; White individuals represented 25% of all suspects; and Latinx individuals represented 23% of all suspects. In FY 2020, Black individuals represented 38% of all suspects; White individuals and Latinx individuals each represented 24% of all suspects. Please refer to the note on disproportionality in the criminal justice system in the introduction.

Figure 76: Race/Ethnicity of Domestic Violence and Stalking Suspects, FY 2020

RACE/ETHNICITY OF SUSPECT	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, DV (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, NON-DV (% OF TOTAL)
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	18 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	4 (5%)
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	298 (8%)	0 (0%)	9 (11%)
BLACK	1,432 (38%)	26 (39%)	20 (25%)
HISPANIC OR LATIN	909 (24%)	10 (15%)	18 (23%)
OTHERS	55 (1%)	4 (6%)	3 (4%)
WHITE	915 (24%)	15 (23%)	19 (24%)
UNKNOWN	144 (4%)	11 (17%)	6 (8%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,771 (100%)</b>	<b>66 (100%)</b>	<b>79 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department



**78%**

of suspects are male

### Gender

The Police Department and the District Attorney’s Office provide gender information of suspects and defendants. Domestic violence suspects are overwhelmingly male; across domestic violence and stalking cases, men represented 80% of suspects in FY 2019 and 78% of suspects in FY 2020. This trend is also reflected in defendants; males represent 85% of

domestic violence and stalking defendants in FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020.

*Figure 77: Gender of Domestic Violence Suspects, FY 2020*

GENDER OF SUSPECT	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, DV (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, NON-DV (% OF TOTAL)
MALE	2,940 (78%)	54 (82%)	82 (85%)
FEMALE	765 (20%)	8 (12%)	10 (10%)
GENDERQUEER/GENDER NON-BINARY	4 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
GENDER INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE (NOT COLLECTED, NOT LISTED, DECLINED/NOT STATED)	62 (2%)	4 (6%)	5 (5%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,771 (100%)</b>	<b>66 (100%)</b>	<b>97 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

*Figure 78: Gender of Defendants by Crime Type, FY 2020*

GENDER OF DEFENDANT	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING (% OF TOTAL)
MALE	444 (85%)	13 (87%)
FEMALE	76 (15%)	2 (13%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>520 (100%)</b>	<b>15 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco District Attorney's Office

## Age

Data from the Police Department and the District Attorney's Office shows that approximately 60% of suspects and defendants are under the age of 40.

*Figure 79: Age of Domestic Violence Suspects, FY 2020*

AGE OF SUSPECT	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, DV (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING, NON-DV (% OF TOTAL)
UNDER-18	19 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
18-29	1,029 (27%)	13 (20%)	20 (21%)
30-39	1,144 (30%)	21 (32%)	24 (25%)
40-49	779 (21%)	14 (21%)	12 (12%)
50-59	381 (10%)	12 (18%)	11 (11%)
60+	163 (4%)	1 (2%)	2 (2%)
UNKNOWN	257 (7%)	5 (8%)	28 (29%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,772 (100%)</b>	<b>66 (100%)</b>	<b>97 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco Police Department

Figure 80: Age of Defendants by Crime Type, FY 2020

AGE OF DEFENDANT	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (% OF TOTAL)	STALKING (% OF TOTAL)
18-25	71 (14%)	2 (13%)
26-35	203 (39%)	4 (27%)
36-45	140 (27%)	3 (20%)
46-55	71 (14%)	5 (33%)
56-65	20 (4%)	1 (7%)
66+	13 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>518 (100%)</b>	<b>15 (100%)</b>

Source: San Francisco District Attorney's Office

## Services Available for Perpetrators

See Appendix B for a full description of the services available to victims and perpetrators.

### Adult Probation Department Services

The Adult Probation Department supervises individuals convicted of domestic violence as they complete the court-ordered conditions of probation. Probation Officers work directly with their clients to develop treatment and rehabilitation plans that are consistent with their criminogenic needs. Figure 81 provides data on the number of persons supervised by the Domestic Violence Unit in FY 2019 and FY 2020. Between the two years, there has been a 3% increase in total number of cases at year-end, a 25% decrease in new intakes, and a 19% increase in completions.

Figure 81: Persons Supervised by Domestic Violence Unit, FY 2019-FY 2020

DV UNIT CASES	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
TOTAL CASES AT YEAR-END	436	450	3%
NEW INTAKES	211	159	-25%
COMPLETIONS	83	99	19%
CASES ONGOING	225	292	30%

Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

When individuals convicted of domestic violence are referred to the Adult Probation Department for supervision, they are referred to a state-mandated 52-week Batterers' Intervention Program, run by a community agency and certified by the Adult Probation Department. There were nine certified Batterers' Intervention Programs in San Francisco as of the end of FY 2020, an increase of two from the previous year. The Department continues to utilize the Batterers' Intervention Program Audit Team to observe, audit and certify the programs.

Figure 82 shows that there were 22 revocations in FY 2019 and 24 revocations, representing 5% of total cases in both years. This marks a 9% increase between years. Probation revocation is one possible outcome for individuals who fail to comply with the conditions of their probation (e.g., failing to attend the Batterers' Intervention Program or being arrested for a new alleged crime). There was a 49% increase in bench warrants issued for non-compliance between FY 2019 and FY 2020.

*Figure 82: Domestic Violence Unit Revocations and Non-Compliance, FY 2019-FY 2020*

DV UNIT REVOCATIONS AND NON-COMPLIANCE	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
REVOCATIONS (NUMBER)	22	24	9%
REVOCATIONS (% OF TOTAL)	5%	5%	0%
BENCH WARRANTS ISSUED FOR NON-COMPLIANCE*	170	254	49%
VIOLATIONS ADDRESSED BY THE COURT**	121	131	8%
NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WHOSE PROBATION WAS REVOKED BY THE COURT	22	20	-9%
*THIS IS THE NUMBER OF WARRANTS, NOT THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITH WARRANTS ISSUED AGAINST THEM. ONE PROBATIONER COULD HAVE SEVERAL WARRANTS.			
**AS ABOVE, THIS IS NOT THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITH VIOLATIONS ADDRESSED.			

Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

### Manalive Program

The Sheriff's Department uses the Manalive Violence Prevention Program curriculum both in the jails and at community-based sites to support domestic violence offenders. Figure 83 shows the number of new clients, exiting clients, and clients referred from the Resolve to Stop the Violence Program (see below for more information about RSVP). This data reflects the fluidity of open enrollment; a participant is likely to enter the program one year and exit in another. The total number of clients served in FY 2020 increased slightly from previous years with 133 total clients served compared to 108 and 104 in FY 2018 and 2019 respectively. Completion rates remained steady at 27% in both FY 2019 and FY 2020, after a decrease from 47% in FY 2018. Exit reasons include completion of program, court release, suspension, termination, and other/unknown. Termination occurs if a participant misses class, is non-compliant or combative, or due to substance use disorders.

*Figure 83: Manalive Program: Individuals Participating, FY 2020*

MANALIVE PARTICIPANTS	FY 2019	FY 2020	% CHANGE
NEW CLIENTS	62	61	-2%
EXITING CLIENTS	74	61	-18%
REFERRED FROM RSVP JAIL PROGRAM	17	11	-35%
TOTAL CLIENTS	104	133	28%
COMPLETION OF PROGRAM (%)	27%	27%	0%

Source: San Francisco Sheriff's Department




### Resolve to Stop the Violence Program (RSVP)

The Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP), managed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, is a survivor-centered program based on a restorative justice model for in-custody male offenders. In FY 2019, the program served 115 individuals with domestic violence charges (35% of 333 total participants). In FY 2020, the program served 56 individuals with domestic violence charges (41% of 137 total participants). In FY 2020, Black participants with DV charges were

overrepresented compared to the general San Francisco population while White and Asian or Pacific Islander participants were underrepresented. Refer to the note in the introduction on disproportionality in the criminal justice system.

*Figure 84: Resolve to Stop the Violence Program: Participants with Domestic Violence Charges by Race/Ethnicity Compared to General San Francisco Population<sup>42</sup>, FY 2020*



Source: San Francisco Sheriff's Department

<sup>42</sup> Source for general San Francisco population by race/ethnicity: American Community Survey, 2019. Percentages are estimates and includes all adults and children in San Francisco City.

## Appendix

### Appendix A: List of Family Violence Council Members in FY 2020

AGENCY	FAMILY VIOLENCE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT	Jana Taylor, Chauncey Robinson
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	Supervisor Catherine Stefani
COMMISSION/DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN	Dr. Emily Murase, Carol Sacco, Elise Hansell
DEPARTMENT OF AGING AND ADULT SERVICES	Akiles Ceron
DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL CARE & CONTROL	Judy Choy
DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES	Karen Roye
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN, YOUTH, & THEIR FAMILIES	Laura Moye
DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	Cecile Soto
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING	Abigail Stewart-Kahn
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES	Maggie McHale
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	Dr. Leigh Kimberg
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	Brad Allred, Tara Anderson
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CONSORTIUM	Beverly Upton
FIRE DEPARTMENT	Mindy Talmadge
FIRST 5	Shelli Rawlings-Fein
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY	Joan Miller
JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT	Paula Hernandez
MAYOR'S OFFICE	Nicole Lindler
MEDICAL EXAMINER	Dr. Ellen Moffatt
POLICE DEPARTMENT	Capt. Sergio Chin
PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE	Kleigh Hathaway
SAFE & SOUND	Katie Albright, Jenny Pearlman
SAN FRANCISCO ELDER ABUSE PREVENTION CENTER	Shawna Reeves
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	Erik Martinez
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT	Delia Ginorio
SUPERIOR COURT	The Honorable Alexandra Robert Gordon

### Appendix B: Services Available

#### Services Available for Victims and Survivors

##### District Attorney's 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 updates, transportation, resources, referrals, and more.

Website: <http://www.sfdistrictattorney.org/>

Phone: 415-553-9044

Email: [victimservices@sfgov.org](mailto:victimservices@sfgov.org)

## Elder Abuse Forensic Center

The San Francisco Elder Abuse Forensic Center (SFEAFC) is a public-private partnership between the non-profit Institute on Aging's Elder Abuse Prevention (EAP) Program and City departments. Its mission is to prevent and combat the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elders and dependent adults in San Francisco through improved collaboration and coordination of professionals within the elder abuse network. A formal referral process to the Forensic Center is utilized by APS, based upon the relative complexity of each case and/or the need for specialized consultation.

Website: <https://www.ioaging.org/>

Phone: 415-750-4111

## Family Resource Centers

Since 2009, San Francisco has benefitted from the Family Resource Center Initiative (FRCI), a system of linguistically and culturally diverse Family Resource Centers where children and families can access local, family-focused, and strength-based services critical to their wellbeing. The FRCI serves both particular neighborhoods and targeted populations of families, for example, homeless families or pregnant or parenting teens.

FRCs provide prevention and early intervention services to increase the healthy dynamics in families and reduce the possibility of issues escalating to more expensive and disruptive services. FRCs support families with access to concrete assistance for basic needs; opportunities for parents to develop into leadership positions within their communities and throughout the city; environments to nurture connections and supportive relationships among parents; parenting education; therapy; and school readiness supports. These services are provided in welcoming atmospheres in a non-stigmatizing, trauma-informed, and culturally responsive manner that truly strengthens families and builds community.

Website: <https://www.first5sf.org/family-resource-center-initiative/>

## Healthcare services

The University of California's Child Trauma Research Program (CTRP) serves families at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (ZSFGH) and at community centers throughout San Francisco and supports young children who have been exposed to a broad range of traumas, by providing intensive mental health services. These traumas go beyond the forms of child abuse and maltreatment recorded in Family and Children's Services data, but many of the traumas are risk factors for child abuse. For example, a child may be referred to the CTRP because they have been separated from their primary caregiver.

Website: <https://childtrauma.ucsf.edu/>

Phone: 415-206-5311

## Integrated Family Services

Safe & Sound launched Integrated Family Services (IFS) in 2014 to provide a two-generation, data-informed approach to preventing child abuse in families in situations that place them at high risk of abuse. Research has shown that families with strong Protective Factors have a significantly reduced risk for child abuse, so IFS provides intensive case management that tailors services to help families strengthen these factors.



Website: <https://safeandsound.org/>  
Phone: 415-441-KIDS (5437)

### Positive Parenting Program

A core service of Family Resource Centers parenting education, including the effective, evidence-based Positive Parenting Program (Triple P). Triple P provides a minimum of eight sequential training sessions for a group of parents and caregivers. Minimum participation standards are set for families to graduate from the course. Parents who enroll and graduate from Triple P show improvement in parenting abilities. For example, parents enrolled in Safe & Sound's Triple P classes showed an overall decrease in problematic parenting, including over-reactivity and laxness, which may progress over time to acts of physical abuse or neglect.

Website: <https://www.first5sf.org/tag/triple-p-positive-parenting-program/>

### SafeStart

SafeStart is a citywide collaborative of Safe & Sound, APA Family Support Services, Instituto Familiar de la Raza, and OMI Family Resource Centers. Together, the collaborative partners with the Domestic Violence Consortium, the San Francisco Police Department's Special Victims Unit and the Family Court to reduce the incidence and impact of exposure to violence, in the community and the home, on children under age six.

Website: <https://www.first5sf.org/resource-center/safe-start-initiative-collaborative/>  
Phone: 415-694-5863

### Safety lessons for children

Although child safety is the mandate of parents, caregivers, and other adults, Safe & Sound believes it is essential to educate children to be aware of risks to their safety, and to speak up if they encounter them. Each year, Safe & Sound teaches personal safety skills, directed at preventing abuse, to school children in grades K-5. Safe & Sound focuses its education programming on elementary schools that have higher percentages of vulnerable children and families.

Website: <https://safeandsound.org/>  
Phone: 415-441-KIDS (5437)

### Survivor Restoration Program

When an offender with a domestic violence related charge is mandated by the court to attend the Sheriff's Department's Batterer Intervention Program, Resolve to Stop the Violence, the Sheriff's Survivor Restoration Project (SRP) is also notified. The Survivor Restoration Project offers direct services to the survivors of the offenders participating in Resolve to Stop the Violence (RSVP). The Project's focus is 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 RSVP.

Website: [http://www.sfsheriff.com/division\\_community.html](http://www.sfsheriff.com/division_community.html)

### TALK Line Parental Support

The TALK Line, operated by Safe & Sound, provides 24/7 telephone support and crisis counseling to parents and caregivers.

Website: <https://safeandsound.org/>  
Phone: 415-441-KIDS (5437)

### Trauma Recovery Center

The University of California, San Francisco Trauma Recovery Center (UCSF-TRC) is a partnership of UCSF with the City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health. The TRC provides mental health and clinical case management services to survivors of interpersonal violence, including but not limited to intimate partner violence, sexual and other physical assaults, gang-related violence, and survivors of political torture and persecution.

Website: <http://traumarecoverycenter.org/>  
Phone: 415-437-3000

### Services Available for Perpetrators

#### Adult Probation Department services

The Adult Probation Department supervises individuals convicted of domestic violence as they complete the court-ordered conditions of probation. Probation Officers work directly with their clients to develop treatment and rehabilitation plans that are consistent with their criminogenic needs.

Website: <https://sfgov.org/adultprobation/>  
Phone: 415-553-1706



#### Child Abuse Intervention Program

The Child Abuse Intervention Program (CAIP) is a treatment program designed in accordance with the California Penal Code as a condition of probation for those convicted of a child abuse offense. 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. Following Adult Probation Department referral, clients undergo an initial screening to determine

suitability and a full psychosocial evaluation, which in most cases establishes medical necessity for treatment. The program includes teaching clients about child abuse prevention methods; anger, violence, and behavioral health treatment; child development and parenting education; substance use treatment linkage; psychiatric medication services; and case management. The membership of the group is fluid: clients graduate, withdraw, and join throughout the year.

#### Juvenile Probation

The Juvenile Probation Department provides services to youth who are alleged and/or have been found to have committed crimes, as well as youth who are alleged to have been/have been found to be beyond their parents' control, runaway, or truant. After their arrest, each youth is assigned a probation officer who investigates the circumstances of the arrest and all relevant social and family issues.

Website: <https://sfgov.org/juvprobation/>  
Phone: 415-753-7800

## Manalive Program

The Sheriff's Department uses the Manalive Violence Prevention Program curriculum both in the jails and at community-based sites to support domestic violence offenders. To complete the program, participants must attend a 52-week court-approved Batterers' Intervention Program. The 52 weeks are broken down into three stages, and the curriculum includes check-ins and feedback that help men identify and articulate emotions, step-by-step deconstruction of violent behaviors, and discussion and breakdown of the male-role belief system. Participants learn practical skills to recognize what triggers them to react with anger, violence and other destructive behaviors, and ways to make alternate, pro-social choices to stop their violence.

Website: <http://communityworkswest.org/program/rsvp/>

## Resolve to Stop the Violence Program (RSVP)

The Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP), managed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, is a survivor-centered program based on a restorative justice model for in-custody offenders. 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.

Website: <http://communityworkswest.org/program/rsvp/>

Phone: 510-268-8116

## DOSW Gender-Based Violence Resources

San Francisco community-based organizations, funded through the Department on the Status of Women, provide essential violence prevention and intervention services to the community. The resource list, linked below, comprises crisis line services, transitional housing resources, information on domestic violence shelter programs, legal services, prevention, education, and training resources, intervention and advocacy services, and national resources. This year, the list also includes COVID-19 information as survivors may be experiencing increased isolation and danger caused by social distancing measures during the Coronavirus public health emergency.

Website: <https://sfgov.org/dosw/sites/default/files/Gender-Based%20Violence%20resources%20v10-19-2020.pdf>

# Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or 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  inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No.  from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic 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 the Imperative Form.**

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: