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Dear Community Member,

Nothing is more important than a safe, strong San Francisco where our residents and visitors can thrive. But our streets and neighborhoods are fighting a battle against violence. That is why I am sharing the San Francisco Violence Prevention Plan (VPP) with you. The comprehensive, 20-point strategic plan outlines immediate and longer-range goals and objectives for preventing violence, particularly youth violence, in San Francisco. Funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, the Violence Prevention Plan is a roadmap to transform areas of violence and neglect into sustainable, safe, strong communities that support healthy outcomes for individuals and families. The Plan is the result of an ambitious year-long process led by the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice in partnership with numerous stakeholders throughout San Francisco and experts from the University of California, San Francisco and the Prevention Institute, a national nonprofit center dedicated to a violence prevention approach that focuses on developing strategy, tools, and capacity to address the complex underlying contributors to violence.

The Plan builds on past successes to meet the current and evolving challenge of preventing violence. Informed by broad array of city and community stakeholders and leaders, members of the public, justice system partners and human service agencies, the Plan renews and amplifies citywide commitments to ensuring a balanced approach to solving violence, including prevention, intervention, law enforcement strategies, and the imperatives of jobs, education and housing, while concurrently laying the foundation for coordinated administrative practices, technological advancements, and accountability for the use of the City’s resources.

The Plan affirms the importance of maximizing the impact of the City’s existing support while also investing strategically in efforts to develop innovative solutions and ensure accountability in achieving concrete, measurable outcomes. The Plan is a living document that will allow us to measure and evaluate what works and make continuous improvements over the next five years.

The Plan will guide the City’s policies and resources over the next five years with a goal of significantly reducing homicide and other forms of violence in our most vulnerable communities and throughout San Francisco. With a heavy emphasis on employment, housing, and education opportunities as well as systems change such as coordination of resources, rigorous commitment to results, and renewed attention to accountability, the outcomes of the Plan are to help our youth and young adults remain Alive & Free and make our neighborhoods safe for all residents.

I look forward to seeing the City and the Community work together towards our vision of a safe San Francisco. City agencies alone cannot combat the issue of violence. Only through collaboration and community engagement will violence truly be prevented and communities transformed. San Francisco residents and visitors deserve nothing less.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
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Thank you! This Plan was made possible through generous funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention secured with help from House Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

Dr. Howard Pinderhughes from the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) is responsible for initiating this important opportunity on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco.

The result of this strategic planning initiative is San Francisco’s first ever comprehensive plan to prevent violence. It is the culmination of intensive collaborative work between city agencies and community based organizations to develop tangible goals and objectives to guide San Francisco’s efforts to reduce violence.

The development of this plan sparked discussions that were at times enlightening, contentious, and engaging, but always centered on one critical focus: how to keep youth and young adults Alive & Free.

Thank you to the Prevention Institute who provided early strategic guidance. Without the expertise of Maya Dillard Smith, Hadley Dynak, Catherine Casey, Olis Simmons, and Zoe Garvin, who contributed tremendously to this strategy and the production of the body of work, this Plan would not have been possible.

This Plan must not get buried on a shelf somewhere. Instead, the City and County of San Francisco must capitalize on this work and aggressively implement the strategies contained herein to build, uplift, and transform the individuals, families and communities who are impacted by the violence in San Francisco. Indeed, San Francisco deserves nothing less.
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As in many cities across the United States, violence in San Francisco is a seemingly intractable problem with a devastating impact on residents and communities. Despite a significant investment of resources and attention paid by local officials to resolve this issue, violence continues to damage the lives of far too many San Franciscans.

The time for a new strategy is now. City agencies and community leaders alike recognize that doing more of the same will likely result in little change. While overall crime rates have improved, the homicide rate has risen, and incidents of assault, family violence, elder abuse, and hate crimes continue. San Francisco cannot afford to refrain from taking bold action for lasting change.

The Violence Prevention Plan provides a roadmap and vision to break out of doing business as usual by placing the sustainability of safe and strong communities at the top of the City’s agenda and by laying the foundation for unprecedented success in preventing and reducing violence.

The Plan calls for a level of investment, coordination, and rigorous commitment to common outcomes that would certainly overwhelm any one official, organization, or department, but the City can come together to realize a common vision of a safe, healthy San Francisco for all. Residents and visitors deserve nothing less.
The Plan is based on several important premises. First and most important, all San Franciscans deserve peaceful homes and communities, and local government has an obligation to take every action possible to help make that a reality. Second, violence is a health issue, just like any other medical disease that can and should be prevented. There are both social conditions and individually engrained behaviors that lead to violence, but preventative measures can be taken to reduce and eventually minimize these root causes. Third, the City recognizes that effectively preventing violence is an intense, long-term and continual effort that must involve all levels of family, community, and government. No one agency or person is singularly responsible at the same time that no one is excluded from partial responsibility for achieving change.

The Plan is organized in four major sections:
1. Introduction and Background.
2. Overview of data trends and patterns of violence in San Francisco.
3. Summary of existing violence prevention efforts to prevent or reduce violence.

The comprehensive strategy is at once simple and multifaceted. The Plan aims to provide a broad enough vision to tackle interrelated and sweeping social issues while including enough detail and specifics to be tangible and concrete. It has been challenging to achieve this balance, and we recognize that there may be aspects that will need adjustment as implementation begins. The Plan is intended to be a blueprint as well as a flexible set of action steps that can be tailored as implementation moves forward and lessons are learned from initial phases. Since the initial planning phase, several of the action steps outlined in this plan have been implemented.

A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

In a nutshell, the Plan aims to carry out three major goals.
1. Coordinate to harmonize the work of City agencies so that local government is more capable of achieving violence prevention.
2. Invest more strategically to increase the community’s capacity to achieve violence prevention in partnership with the City.
3. Hold City and community accountable for achieving concrete, short and longer term, measurable outcomes.

1. Coordinate to harmonize the work of City agencies so that local government is more capable of achieving violence prevention.

During the planning process, we discovered that, while many City agencies actively engage in a variety of violence prevention efforts, the City as a whole needs a coordinated strategy that links these efforts together, promotes partnerships and collaboration, avoids duplication of efforts, and fills gaps in service. Individual agency efforts need to be connected and leveraged for shared data, planning, and evaluation. To achieve these goals, Mayor Gavin Newsom established an Interagency Council (IAC) to facilitate interdepartmental collaboration and cooperation to carry out his vision to
better serve the City’s vulnerable populations. The IAC is responsible for coordinating Mayor Newsom’s five signature initiatives aimed at transforming vulnerable communities, including: Communities of Opportunities, HOPE SF, CityBuild/RAMP/Workforce Development, Transitional Age Youth, and the San Francisco Violence Prevention Plan. To ensure the work of the IAC is successful, particularly around violence prevention programs, the City needs a uniform policy mandate from elected officials making the urgency of this level of coordination clear.

Building on the work that has already been initiated by Mayor Gavin Newsom, and to improve the way City agencies work together in partnership with the community, the Plan proposes the following action steps:

• Issue an executive directive that declares violence a health crisis that must be addressed through concentrated and strategic interagency efforts, community investments, and widespread public education (underway by Mayor).

• Appoint a new Violence Prevention Director who is tasked with guiding and facilitating the implementation of this plan, under the direction of the Mayor and in coordination with all city and community agencies involved in violence prevention (completed).

• Enact legislation to establish and codify a Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) with membership from both City agencies and the community. The VPAC will 1) integrate the community voice into policy and planning, 2) conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the plan to monitor progress and hold city agencies accountable and 3) recommend adjustments in the 5-Year workplan (completed).

• Structure the City’s financial resources, programmatic resources, staffing, and data tracking systems to support achieving the shared measurable outcomes and to fill gaps in services (underway by MOCI).

2. Invest more strategically to increase the community’s capacity to achieve violence prevention in partnership with the City.

San Francisco has a rich and diverse set of community organizations deeply committed to preventing violence and improving health outcomes for residents. These community organizations make enormous contributions to the City’s residents. They are the job trainers, mentors, outreach workers, counselors, case managers, healers, and allies for so many of our at-risk residents. The challenge before San Francisco is creating a unified method for aligning the city/community vision and ensuring that the community-level work is able to operate at its highest capacity with a solid infrastructure that supports outcomes for vulnerable San Franciscans.
To better invest in community capacity to achieve violence prevention, the Plan proposes the following action steps:

- The IAC will work together to define and adopt shared principles of community transformation. These discussions should begin with existing vision for COO and HOPE SF (pending).

- Coordinate grant making and compliance processes in the City so that it is uniform and strategic across City agencies and more efficient and effective for community agencies (underway by MOCI).

- Develop a coordinated service delivery model to reduce duplication of efforts, and coordinate information sharing that will be responsive to neighborhood needs and serve the whole family (underway by COO).

- Centralize planning, coordination, and implementation of the City’s capacity building efforts to build community institutions that are able to operate at capacity and the highest skills level (pending).

- Coordinate and strengthen community outreach strategies to elevate residents’ connectedness to City and community programs as well as their capacity to get organized and have a voice in public policy (underway by MOCJ).

3. Hold City and community agencies accountable for achieving concrete, short and longer term, measurable outcomes in 10-key policy areas.

By developing outcome-oriented strategies, the Plan aims to focus city and community efforts on working in such a way that results in real, measurable change for San Francisco’s vulnerable residents. Adopting a measurable-outcomes framework means identifying specific outcomes, or change, that we want to achieve as a result of a particular strategy or set of strategies and setting benchmarks to guide efforts and monitor progress and success. Specific examples of measurable outcomes and benchmarks include “reduce recidivism by 10%,” “reduce truancy by 20%,” or “increase financial stability for 300 low income families.” The benchmarks serve as a barometer of how much change we want to achieve for a particular outcome. This “outcomes” framework will direct the coordination efforts of the Interagency Council, Violence Prevention Advisory Committee and the Violence Prevention Director as well as drive the City’s decision-making on what programs and services warrant investment.

There are numerous, important, and large-scale existing efforts in several city departments that are already working to achieve improved outcomes in many of these priority policy areas. As a City, we need to agree across agencies on the outcomes to be achieved in each of these policy areas so that the existing efforts are strengthened, supported, and connected to one another, and so that we can create new efforts in areas with identified gaps. The Plan attempts to collectively embrace the best of the existing efforts to achieve these outcomes; and, rather than reinventing the wheel, suggests ways to work together to redesign and/or develop new efforts in areas that lack coherent outcomes.

While significant restructuring and realignment needs to happen across city and community agencies to truly achieve violence prevention, this shift will
coalesce over a period of time, and the City cannot lose sight of the need for immediate action to alleviate some of the violence in communities hardest hit.

For this reason, the Plan lays out a measurable outcomes framework in two phases, immediate and longer-term. In the short-term, the Interagency Council and Violence Prevention Advisory Committee should embrace an immediate “triage” strategy that targets the most at-risk community members for strategic interventions, with community support.

In the longer-term, from 2008 to 2013, the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee should work to achieve simultaneous, “big picture” outcomes in 10-key policy areas identified in the planning process as the major priorities for reducing violence. These are: Jobs; Housing; Education; Reentry; Family Support and Elder Support; Youth Development; Community Empowerment; Trauma Reduction; Community Policing; and Access to Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs.

THE IMMEDIATE TRIAGE STRATEGY

Using a health approach to reduce violence based on the successful model San Francisco enacted to reduce chronic homelessness, the immediate triage strategy to reduce violence will focus on interventions for two of the populations most at-risk for being involved in violence as victims and perpetrators: high risk young adult probationers, and youth and their families already involved in the overlapping child welfare systems (dependency, delinquency, and welfare). In a nutshell, data indicate these are the two populations most impacted by violence and thus the populations who require “treatment” first.

Two promising city/community efforts, led by MOCJ in collaboration with the City’s social service and law enforcement agencies, have laid the groundwork for this short-term strategic intervention. The first effort, the Call-In Strategy, brings together key City agencies and community-based service providers to “call-in” and provide services to 150 individuals identified by city data to be at the highest risk for being victims or perpetrators of violence. The second effort, the Summer Street Violence Prevention Council, identifies the most at-risk youth and their families in the City based on their current involvement in the overlapping public systems. This effort overlaps and dovetails closely with current planning to launch a family-centered coordinated case management model to address the multitude of factors that put these youth and their families at risk for violence.

The Plan proposes that these promising efforts become solidified, strengthened, and adopted as the immediate triage strategy for violence prevention. Specific triage recommendations include:

- Expand the Call-In Strategy as a model for multi-agency probationer intervention with a focus on institutionalizing geographically-assigned coordinated supervision/case management for high risk probationers and parolees. Each team would include a Probation Officer and a community
case manager working collaboratively to supervise and support these ex-offenders.

- Build on the work of the Summer Street Violence Prevention Council and Communities of Opportunity (COO) to create coordinated case management teams to address violence issues for youth and their families with multi-system involvement.

- Coordinate outreach efforts and service providers to improve methods to connect with high risk individuals more frequently and make targeted referrals between programs and services to meet the specific needs of each individual.

- Craft an aggressive citywide anti-violence public education campaign to spread a broader community message in support of violence prevention, and to stimulate individual and community behavior change related to violence.

---

One of the most difficult challenges before the city is balancing the public’s expectation for immediate results and reductions in violence with strategies to sustain violence prevention beyond short term, band-aid fixes.

- Create Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) for data and information sharing across social service departments and law enforcement agencies with attention to protecting privacy and confidentiality rights.

5-YEAR WORKPLAN: 10 KEY POLICY AREAS

The immediate triage strategy is necessary to intervene to save the lives of individuals and families engulfed in immediate crisis and most at risk for being victims or perpetrators of violence. While this intervention is essential to mitigating violence in the short term, it must be coupled with longer term strategies that lay the foundation for sustainable prevention over time.

One of the most difficult challenges before the City is balancing the public’s expectation for immediate results and reductions in violence with strategies to sustain violence prevention beyond short term, band-aid fixes. While the City has an obligation to protect the sense of safety and well-being of all of its residents, the reality is that the root causes of violence are multifaceted and highly complex and thus requires a plan of action as complex in scope and scale. Therefore, the Plan seeks to honor the need for urgent, yet sustainable solutions,
balancing short term intervention with longer term prevention strategies, linking existing violence prevention and intervention efforts, and investing the City’s resources more strategically in primary prevention, intervention, and response/suppression strategies.

Currently, San Francisco invests the bulk of its violence prevention resources on intervention and response/suppression activities. Renewed attention to primary prevention is paramount to sustaining reductions in violence over time. True primary prevention focuses on mitigating the onset of violence. This is often achieved through strategies such as media campaigns aimed at raising awareness about factors that contribute to violence and changing community norms about violence, school-based curriculum that promotes conflict resolution and mediation, and policy advocacy that promotes true prioritization of violence prevention; funnels local, state, and national resources; and drives violence prevention efforts. Effective prevention strategies often require substantial upfront investment. Over time, however, prevention typically costs significantly less than intervention and crisis response strategies, resulting in substantial cost savings overall.

The Plan aims to focus City efforts on specific prevention strategies in 10 key policy areas to address the root causes of violence: Jobs; Housing; Education; Reentry; Family Support; Youth Development; Community Empowerment; Trauma Reduction; Community Policing; and Access to Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs.

The strategies in this section focus on 1) multi-agency coordination around specific policy issues and projects, 2) public education campaigns to increase community awareness and alter community norms related to violence and 3) policy advocacy to influence renewed attention to a state and national urban agenda centered on violence prevention and public safety. A sampling of the strategies in each of the 10 policy areas is provided below.

• Jobs: There is a strong correlation between violence and poverty which is spurred by lack of permanent, livable wage employment for individuals and communities vulnerable to violence. Addressing the barriers that keep individuals from economic self-sufficiency and providing training and pathways to permanent jobs are a few of the most important strategies to prevent violence. The employment strategies contained in the Plan aim to increase employment rates for low income residents by providing a ladder of employment opportunities ranging from pre-employment preparation, to subsidized training, to permanent employment. Specific employment strategies include:

1. Adopt and implement the MOEWD Workforce Development Plan to centralize workforce policy and streamline programming and evaluation with a renewed focus on employment needs and services in violence prone neighborhoods.

2. Create on-ramps and points of entry for vulnerable individuals using a uniform ladder of opportunity across city funded programs which include Service Learning, Subsidized Employment, Unsubsidized Employment, and High Wage Careers.

Effective prevention strategies often require substantial up front investment. Over time, however, prevention typically costs significantly less than intervention and crisis response strategies, resulting in substantial cost savings overall.
3. Coordinate services across city-funded agencies to address pre-employment barriers for at-risk individuals (i.e. Clean Slate, Child Support Enforcement, counseling, and drug treatment).

4. Connect at-risk individuals to emerging employment opportunities (e.g. green jobs).

**Housing:** San Francisco is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis resulting in few quality housing options for low and even middle income families. Rising housing costs and limited supply of affordable housing options coupled with the out migration of middle class families, particularly African Americans, has resulted in intense geographical concentration of poverty in and around public housing. There is a strong correlation between public housing and violence. Nationally, individuals who live in public housing are twice as likely to be impacted by gun violence than people who do not live in public housing. HOPE SF holds tremendous promise for improving the quality of public housing in San Francisco, yet this Plan also focuses attention on strategies to improve the safety and physical conditions in San Francisco public housing as a short term violence reduction strategy. Specific housing strategies include:

1. Support the SFHA and City Partnership for Safe and Decent Public Housing and the implementation of HOPE SF.

2. Review SFHA existing work order and discharge requests processes and make refinements as necessary to ensure that repairs occur in a timely manner.

3. Devise strategies to strengthen and expand victim/witness protection services and pursue local, regional, and national solutions to witness protection/relocation challenges.

4. Increase opportunities for community engagement among public housing residents by providing support to strengthen resident associations.

**Education:** Negative school-related experiences such as poor academic performance, truancy, and dropping out of school are predictors of future criminal and violent behavior. Over the past four years, nearly 94 percent of homicide victims in San Francisco under the age of 25 were high school dropouts. Improving the quality of education, increasing access to alternative educational opportunities, and devising effective strategies to address truancy and school connectedness are critical to mitigating and preventing violence. The education strategies in the Plan focus on building meaningful multi-agency approaches to solving these problems to improve the educational attainment of our most at risk children. Specific strategies include:

1. Support the Partnership for Achievement between the City of San Francisco and SFUSD and strengthen mechanisms for SFUSD and city agencies to engage in effective program coordination and improve academic performance among students from at-risk communities.

2. Support the launch of The Center for Academic Reentry and Empowerment (CARE) for truancy reduction.

Addressing the barriers that keep individuals from economic self-sufficiency and providing training and pathways to permanent jobs are a few of the most important strategies to prevent violence.
3. Support the development and implementation of a uniform violence prevention curriculum in San Francisco public schools to be taught to all pupils beginning in elementary school, including social-cognitive skills, conflict resolution, and cultural competency.

4. Strengthen the collaboration between SFPD, MUNI, SFUSD, and CBOs engaged in school-based violence prevention to enhance uniform school safety protocols for all public schools.

- **Reentry:** Studies show a high rate of recidivism among people on parole and probation. In 2003, more than 2,500 felons were paroled to San Francisco. Within three years of their release, 59% of California's adult parolees recidivate and go back to state prison. In San Francisco the recidivism rate is closer to 70%. In response, many city agencies are invested in improving the services and programs for individuals reentering San Francisco communities after incarceration. These efforts could be dramatically improved by enhancing supervision capacity and strengthening interagency coordination to better plan and deliver effective reentry services within a comprehensive reentry strategy to achieve meaningful reductions in recidivism. Specific reentry strategies include:

1. Fully constitute the Reentry Coordinating Council to integrate the San Francisco Reentry Council and Safe Communities Reentry Council into one body to streamline reentry policy and planning for San Francisco.

2. Through the City’s Reentry Coordinating Council, develop a Strategic Plan for Reentry and enhance coordination and working partnerships across agencies providing reentry services to increase the utilization of these services by re-entering individuals.

3. Enhance reentry focused job placement and housing placement programs by conducting a gaps analysis and either expanding effective programs or developing model programs where appropriate.

4. Reduce probation caseloads and build the capacity of probation officers through enhanced resources and training opportunities.

- **Youth Development and Empowerment:** Hopelessness and disconnection from caring adults can increase youth’s risk of becoming involved in violence. Youth development and empowerment builds agency and authority in young people to promote well-being and reduce harm in their lives and their communities. Providing young people with greater opportunities for development and growth serves to protect them from the negative dynamics of crime and violence. The Plan’s youth development strategies focus on providing greater leadership opportunities to young people and increasing the opportunities available to youth to act as peer mentors and arbiters of peer conflicts. Specific youth development strategies include:
1. Expand community capacity to provide effective youth development and empowerment programming in at risk communities through multi-agency investment, uniform and strengthened training strategies and monitoring strategies.

2. Assess and strengthen opportunities for intergenerational engagement, faith-based community involvement, cultural competency, and gender specific services.

- **Community Transformation**: Community deterioration and lack of cohesiveness plague San Francisco’s most violence prone neighborhoods. Social connectedness, resident involvement, and positive environmental changes that clean up blight and green neighborhoods can significantly promote safety and lessen the frequency of violent incidents. Strategies in this section aim to strengthen neighborhood development and resident engagement. Specific community empowerment strategies include:

  1. Strengthen city agency coordination to clean up blight and make environmental improvements in high violence areas (i.e. lighting and greening projects).
  2. Strengthen neighborhood and resident associations in high violence areas.
  3. Strengthen community outreach and public education strategies for community involvement in neighborhood empowerment efforts, and encourage key stakeholders that do not typically participate in such efforts to become actively engaged.

- **Family Support and Senior Support**: Family violence is widely recognized as a root cause of crime and violence for children later in life. Family violence is precipitated by issues such as substance abuse, poverty, and incarceration. Family support services are designed to strengthen families by helping parents to raise safe and healthy children, supporting them to become self-sufficient, and encouraging them to take an active role in their communities. Additionally, as family members age, the responsibility of caring for elders often becomes the responsibility of family. The responsibility of caring for elders can cause stress and frustration for caregivers and sometimes leads to elder abuse. Many cultural and socioeconomic factors also affect the risk of elder abuse. The depiction of old people as frail, weak, and dependent; strained familial relationships as a result of stress and frustration as an old person becomes more dependent; caregivers’ dependence for accommodation or financial support; social isolation due to physical or mental health issues; and the loss of friends/family are just some contributing factors. The Plan’s family support and senior support strategies focus on providing greater support and training for parents and families in San Francisco’s toughest neighborhoods. Specific family and senior support strategies include:

  1. Ensure that families have access to high quality family support programs and services especially for those in greatest need.
  2. Support the development and launch of Parent University, a community resource which will offer services and programs for parents and families.
  3. Strengthen in-home support services for seniors and training for family caregivers.
  4. Support training and ongoing assistance to family support programs to provide high-quality family support services in accordance with the family support standards.

- **Trauma Reduction**: Witnessing or experiencing violence leads to trauma and is directly correlated with future risk of violent behavior. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) is a growing ailment in San Francisco communities most impacted by violence. Helping individuals, families, and communities heal from violence is at the core of trauma reduction efforts.
Providing comprehensive support and coordinated services to individuals and families who have witnessed or experienced violence is important as is reducing exposure to violent images and messages and supporting positive images and models in families, communities and the media. The Plan’s trauma reduction strategies focus on public education campaigns that raise consciousness about the longer term effects of violence and also address the needs of people who are living with trauma to reduce the likelihood that they too will be involved in future violent activities. Specific trauma reduction strategies include:

1. Enhance multi-agency coordination of existing trauma reduction programs (including CRT, CRN, victims’ services, Teen Trauma Recovery Center, Trauma Recovery Center, Wraparound Project, SFUSD Wellness Centers).

2. Strengthen protocols for identifying children exposed to violence and children with PTSD and enhance steps to connect them to services.

3. Adjust deployment of mental health services to be more geographically and home based.

4. Promote the importance of self-care and adequate staff development to address the vicarious trauma experienced by service providers working with individuals in crisis.

5. Promote the importance of self-care and adequate staff development to address the vicarious trauma experienced by service providers working with individuals in crisis.

- **Community Policing**: In our most violent neighborhoods, community police relations are strained, impeding cooperation and information. Community Policing is a policing strategy and philosophy built on the premise that community interaction and support can help control crime and violence, with community members helping to identify suspects, and bring problems to the attention of police. The Plan’s community policing strategies focus on 1) assessing the police department’s ability to strategically and uniformly integrate community policing practices into the practice and culture of the department and 2) supporting the continued work of the Community Policing Advisory Committee. Specific community policing strategies include:

1. Implement the Community Policing Advisory Committee recommendations.

2. Expand community policing training for officers and community members through a collaborative effort between the Police Academy, SFUSD and community-based organizations.

3. Develop a community policing strategy specific to San Francisco Housing Authority properties.
• **Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs:** The accessibility of firearms and the frequency with which they are used in disputes is alarming because they often lead to murder and serious injury. The use of firearms is often coupled with alcohol and drug usage. Nationwide, alcohol is the drug most closely associated with violent incidents. Research strongly suggests that alcohol, like other drugs, acts as a multiplier of crime. Neighborhoods where there is a concentration of liquor stores often suffer from alcohol-related social problems. The strategies in this section of the Plan, are focused on 1) citywide public education about the negative impact of firearms, alcohol, and drugs, 2) school-based prevention strategies for students, and 3) working with San Francisco state and national elected officials to support legislation to curb the availability and accessibility of firearms, alcohol, and drugs.

Specific strategies include:

1. Launch a public education campaign to send a strong message against gun violence and illegal gun activity emphasizing responsible gun ownership, educating youth about gun safety, increasing awareness of existing laws, and highlighting the danger of replicas.

2. Partner with local state and national elected officials to develop and advocate for legislation to reform hand gun laws.

3. Strengthen law enforcement collaboration to remove guns from the street and respond uniformly to gun violence.


**PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURE**

Five key initiatives represent Mayor Gavin Newsom’s commitment to the transformation of San Francisco’s vulnerable communities: Communities of Opportunity, HOPE SF, CityBuild/RAMP/Workforce Development, Transitional Age Youth, and the San Francisco Violence Prevention Plan. Department directors, executive level City staff, directors of community organizations, local leaders, and many community stakeholders have invested hundreds of hours together on this work. Each of these five initiatives has a unique focus, yet there is significant overlap in the recommendations that have resulted from them. Specifically, each calls for improved city coordination, data sharing, and stronger partnerships with the community and CBOs. There is strong overlap in recommendations which are focused primarily in three policy areas 1) Education, 2) Housing, and 3) Employment. Each called for an interagency governance structure to oversee implementation with participation of many of the same agencies. Finally, each initiative proposes the
establishment of community advisory groups to ensure community involvement and engagement in the processes.

1. Proposed Governance Structure

To prevent duplication of efforts, decrease burden on City departments, streamline City bureaucracy, and create a new system for sharing information and ensuring accountability, a single Interagency Council has been established to oversee Mayor Newsom’s five signature initiatives. The Interagency Council (IAC) will be managed and staffed by the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD), to facilitate interdepartmental collaboration and cooperation to better serve the City’s vulnerable populations.

The Mayor has also codified legislation establishing a Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) with City and community representation. The VPAC will coordinate closely with other advisory committees to monitor trends and develop relevant violence prevention policies and integrated strategies ranging from primary prevention to intervention, response and law enforcement.

2. Align Policy and Data Interagency Groups

The Mayor has convened policy clusters in eight distinct content areas including housing, community development, education, and public safety among others. At the same time, the City is engaged in a comprehensive data project, SFSTAT, to capture shared outcome measures across the eight policy areas. The Violence Prevention Plan is recommending the alignment of the policy clusters and SFSTAT so that the policy directives inform the kind of outcome measures to be tracked, and the data collected should inform the direction of policy and programs. If done properly, the policy clusters would operate more effectively by providing data-driven policy recommendations for interagency collaboration, identifying resource alignment needs, overseeing implementation of recommendations, reviewing data to track progress, and communicating back to departments on required actions.

3. Engage and Empower Existing Committees, Councils, and Task Forces

San Francisco has hundreds of community and interagency task forces and other advisory bodies. To draw upon these groups and structures, the City aims to elevate and empower existing councils to coordinate efforts on distinct policy issues such as workforce development, re-entry, and housing, and serve as official subject matter committees of the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC). These entities will work with the VPAC to ensure the Plan maintains its focus in key policy areas, moves efforts in the correct direction, and upholds the integrity necessary to affect change.

The City recognizes that effectively preventing violence is an intense, long-term and continual effort that must involve all levels of family, community, and government. No one agency or person is singularly responsible at the same time that no one is excluded from partial responsibility for achieving change.
The City recognizes that effectively preventing violence is an intense, long-term and continual effort that must involve all levels of family, community, and government. No one agency or person is singularly responsible at the same time that no one is excluded from partial responsibility for achieving change.

4. Built-in Monitoring and Accountability

Communities must be actively engaged in San Francisco violence prevention efforts through clear and open processes with opportunities for on-going community input and participation, particularly affected communities. To ensure accountability and transparency with the implementation of the Violence Prevention Plan and the allocation of violence prevention resources, the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee will have at least six additional at-large community seats. The committee will work closely with the Violence Prevention Director to ensure that there are adequate ongoing avenues for community voice in the planning and implementation of the City’s violence prevention work, as well as shared responsibility for outcomes.

5. Project Staffing

The Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD) will manage and implement the Interagency Council. In January 2008, Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed a Violence Prevention Director tasked with guiding and facilitating the development, planning and implementation of the Violence Prevention Plan. The Violence Prevention Director will serve as the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee’s chairperson, and will work with members of the Committee to update the Plan every five years beginning January 2013 to ensure that the Plan include strategies that address emerging trends and changing needs in the ten key policy areas identified in the original Plan.
By any measure, the rates of violence in San Francisco are unacceptable. Although much progress has been made, homicides, nonfatal shootings, domestic violence, elder abuse, and many other forms of violence tear families apart, traumatize entire communities, and send waves of fear and despair throughout the City’s diverse communities. What can we do different? Why is this happening? How do we break a cycle that’s been spinning for decades? These are the questions that haunt so many, from the highest levels of government to local residents living in fear.

Sadly, the epidemic of violence in San Francisco mirrors circumstances permeating urban centers in every major city in the nation. Homicide rates in Atlanta, Miami, Baltimore, Oakland and so many other cities continue to rise unabated, despite a wide range of efforts to reverse the trends. Nationally, so much of the violence in urban centers is connected to an ongoing lack of social and economic opportunities, neighborhood blight, and disconnected communities, families, and individuals experiencing seemingly hopeless conditions. Violence serves as a device that degrades the economic and social fabric and blocks valiant efforts to nurture and sustain a healthier, robust community.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested each year to implement a range of activities to both prevent and reduce violence from occurring, and to assist those already affected. A myriad of task forces have been convened and action plans and blueprints have been penned to address the loss of life.
property, and safety in neighborhoods throughout the City. To date, attempts to curb violence have been insufficient; however, city leaders, residents, business owners and other key stakeholders remain steadfastly committed to a new day. The City continues to try and capitalize on its unique position of well-resourced services, best practice programs, and intellectual and financial capital to mount an effective approach to prevent violence.

In order to move forward effectively, San Francisco must cultivate the capacity to implement and sustain an effective violence prevention strategy, and maintain the political will to address violence in all sectors of the city. To this end, the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice, in collaboration with UCSF, initiated a violence prevention planning process in 2006 to engage leaders from key city departments, partner agencies, and affected communities to develop a strategic plan for violence prevention in San Francisco.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Realizing the need for a new and coordinated approach to address the problem of violence in San Francisco, Dr. Howard Pinderhughes from the University of California, San Francisco approached the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice in 2005 with a planning grant opportunity from the US Department of Justice. An application was submitted, the grant awarded, and a project staff was hired to manage the planning process and gather resident input. The Prevention Institute, a nonprofit national center dedicated to building momentum for primary prevention, was engaged to provide additional assistance.

The planning process was designed to draw on the expertise of key stakeholders from City agencies, community organizations and neighborhood constituents. Participants requested two things from the onset: a timeline reflecting the level of urgency, and a resulting Plan with specific and actionable recommendations. A three-part structure was devised to accommodate an aggressive six-month meeting schedule and ensure a timely and meaningful process. The structure included a Planning Workgroup, a Leadership Council, and a series of community dialogues.

- In January 2007, the Planning Workgroup was convened, comprised of a multi-disciplinary group of high-level representatives from human service agencies, criminal justice institutions, and community organizations. The Workgroup was charged with developing the substance and content of the Plan. Briefings were held with City department directors after each Workgroup meeting to share the direction of the discussions and solicit input on policy implications.

- A Leadership Council was formed in March 2007 to convene the Planning Workgroup and department directors together to prioritize recommendations and specific action steps for implementation. Throughout the Plan’s development MOCJ staff conducted research and met with various officials and stakeholders to move the process forward, answer questions, and generate buy-in. Ad hoc groups were convened to discuss specific issues and the viability of emerging strategies.

- Finally, to ensure an informed process, a series of community dialogues were held concurrently throughout the city to collect suggestions about responsive strategies and unearth existing service gaps. Over the course of five months, over 200 individuals attended 25 community dialogues. This feedback was presented to both the Planning Workgroup and Leadership Council, and the findings were instrumental in directing the strategy development phase of the process.

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A set of core concepts were developed to serve as a touchstone for participants and ensure that the process and resulting recommendations remained true to the original intention, fostered community involvement, and served as a catalyst for immediate and long-term interventions.

A vision statement was created to give shape, future direction, and inspiration to the City’s efforts to prevent violence. The group agreed on the following language.
VISION: To create a sustainable violence-free environment for all San Franciscans.

The vision seeks to sustain long-term reductions in the incidence and prevalence of violence by building the capacity of individuals, families, neighborhoods, and institutions; developing integrated strategies that foster positive outcomes for people and communities; advancing multi-sector and city-community partnerships; providing constructive alternatives; focusing on the greatest need; and ensuring accountability throughout.

In addition, 12 principles were developed to specify the essential values that ground the planning process and the work of participants.

TWELVE PRINCIPLES:

1. All San Francisco neighborhoods have a right to be violence free.

2. Violent behavior can be prevented. Violence is often learned and strongly influenced and reinforced by circumstantial and environmental factors that can be altered.

3. Violence is a symptom of other social problems.

4. Different forms of violence are interrelated such as family violence, community violence, dating violence and institutional violence.

5. Community input, engagement and leadership are vital to defining the problem and prioritizing and implementing violence prevention strategies. Violence prevention strategies must be accountable to the community.

6. Community knowledge and lived experiences must influence and inform the process, recommendations, and decisions. People who are directly impacted by violence have expertise and historical perspectives that must be incorporated into the solution.

7. It is vital to identify promising practices and effective strategies in San Francisco and build on, coordinate, and support existing efforts.

8. It is essential to identify and implement culturally competent strategies as well as cross cultural approaches that work across communities.

9. The continuum of prevention recognizes that intervention, including response and treatment, have a relationship to and can support primary prevention activities.

10. City community partnership is essential to positive outcomes for individuals and communities.

11. Decisions about violence prevention and the allocation of resources should be data-driven. Violence prevention strategies should be evaluated.

12. Violence prevention is an ongoing and long-term effort that must be sustained over time.
FOCUSING THE PROCESS

The primary focus of the planning process was to increase the City’s capacity to truly stop violence – before it occurs. The work was grounded in an analysis of the underlying socio-economic, environmental, and community factors that contribute to the problem. While the Plan emphasizes prevention, it also addresses intervention and enforcement to create a comprehensive, correlated, and overlapping strategy since violence does not occur in a vacuum.

Creating a Common Language

The Planning Workgroup developed a series of working definitions to facilitate communication and ensure participants were operating from a common point of understanding about the meaning of violence and violence prevention. A number of examples were considered from other planning documents produced both locally and nationally. The following definitions were approved.

VIOLENCE is the use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, by an individual, group or institution that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, or psychological harm. The threat or act can be against oneself, another person, or against a group or community. A variety of factors* at the family, community, and societal level combine to create an environment that contributes to violence and violent behavior.

(Factors include oppression, discrimination and other structural factors that create conditions for violent behavior).

Violence Prevention

• Requires a comprehensive, multi-faceted, and strategic approach that considers multiple risk factors and root causes when developing solutions.

• Addresses the fundamental issues of empowerment, education, and economic opportunities.

• Requires institutional coordination and information sharing.

• Supports the healthy development of individuals, families, schools, and communities; builds capacity for positive relationships and interactions; and builds resilience to protect individuals against violence despite harmful environments and experiences.

• Includes grassroots involvement, while fostering community ownership of violence prevention approaches—ultimately creating healthy communities where people can grow in dignity and safety.

• Recognizes that effective approaches range from primary prevention to intervention, such as response and treatment. These efforts have a relationship to one another and must be supportive.
• Integrates evaluation into all efforts, holds stakeholders accountable for making improvements, and ensures that findings inform practice and decision-making.

Defining the Scope
Understanding that violence of different forms is largely interrelated and impacts a single person or family on numerous fronts, the Plan is designed to specifically address the following types of violence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF VIOLENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Youth Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street/Gang Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hate Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elder Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intimate Partner/Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because street violence and youth violence often lead to homicide and thus captures almost daily media attention, there is a greater sense of urgency around addressing this type of violence over other forms. While each type of violence listed above is addressed by strategies contained in the Plan, the strategies are heavily focused on street and youth violence. Greater attention should be focused on strengthening strategies that address the other forms of violence, which are often under represented when thinking about this vast health issue. In addition, the Plan seeks to prevent violence citywide and reduce the impact on all residents.

However, while the rise in violent crime is persistent, the trends are not reflected across all sectors of the city. Instead, violent incidents persist in specific geographic areas, often in and around public housing sites. Public housing residents, poor people, and people of color especially African Americans, are disproportionately affected. Transitional age youth ages 16-24 are at particular risk. Thus, the following population groups are most directly targeted by the strategies outlined in the Plan.

Steps in the Process
While there are a number of commonly accepted elements in a successful process, in general planning is iterative; it maturates, and has to have enough flexibility to be responsive to findings. The San Francisco Violence Prevention Planning process was no different in this regard; however, four specific steps informed the development of the Plan and its recommendations.

1. Problem Analysis

The problem analysis focused on developing a common understanding about the scope and nature of violence in San Francisco. As a first step, the risk and resiliency factors that contribute to the problem locally were considered. Risk factors are defined as characteristics or circumstances that increase the likelihood of an individual, family, or community being affected by or perpetrating violence. Resilience factors are those characteristics that support the healthy development of individuals, families, schools, and communities; build capacity for positive relationships and interactions; and limit violence despite harmful environments and practices.
As a second step of the problem analysis local, state, and national epidemiological data were reviewed. Priority rankings were assigned to the factors and the data findings helped to focus the process, drive initial efforts, and provide a basis for decision-making, resource allocation, and coordination.

2. **Strategic Issue Identification**

Over a series of meetings and through discussions with key stakeholders, a number of cross-cutting themes emerged to serve as a structure for 1) organizing the violence prevention priorities and 2) suggesting specific strategies to define and direct the structural and systems change that needs to occur in San Francisco. Ten strategic issue areas were identified to serve as the foundation of the Plan. These areas include: Jobs; Housing; Education; Reentry; Family Support; Youth Development; Community Empowerment; Trauma Reduction; Community Policing; and Access to Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs.

3. **System Assessment**

An analysis of existing services, programs, and resources; their function; and their organization within the complex web of violence prevention efforts citywide informed strategy development. Where possible, information about gaps and challenges were also identified. Assessment findings were collected from key informant interviews as well as a review of source documents and web content.

4. **Strategy Development**

Strategic recommendations were identified for each of the ten issue areas, designed to strengthen existing systems, address gaps, and create a coordinated prevention and response system. These recommendations were culled from the Workgroup, community dialogues, and drawn from existing reports, plans, and assessments. While the need to improve outcomes in these ten areas became clear during strategy development, two other priority goals emerged as well. The first focused on changing the way that the city itself works together and responds to violence. The second focused on building the community capacity necessary to deliver quality and effective violence prevention programs and services. Specific objectives were developed to achieve these goals, and across each, shared decision-making, shared data, and shared evaluation became underlying themes of the Plan.
OVERARCHING FINDINGS

• Violence in San Francisco is rising.
  While progress has been made, from 2005 to 2007, violent crime rose
  7% and homicides reached a decade high. Data from San Francisco
  General Hospital indicate firearm violence is rising. Police data also
  shows a dramatic increase in the use of knives.

• Violence is concentrated in specific neighborhoods and linked to
  public housing sites.
  The 2005 DPH report titled, “Local Data for Local Violence Prevention,”
  found that the majority of homicides and assault injuries occurred in
  five of San Francisco’s 24 zip codes encompassing Bayview/Hunters
  Point, Western Addition, Visitacion Valley, Mission, and Tenderloin
  neighborhoods. A majority of the City’s public housing units are
  concentrated in these neighborhoods. Over the past decade, a significant
  number of violent incidents were linked to public housing. Nationally,
  public housing residents are twice as likely to be affected by violence as
  people paying market rate rent.

• Violence is highly correlated with poverty and unemployment.
  Poverty is a widely accepted indicator of risk for involvement with
  violence as either a victim, perpetrator, or both. A recent study on
  homicide victims and perpetrators found nearly every victim from 2004
to 2005 lived high poverty census tracts. Victims and survivors of domestic violence and child abuse are also more likely to live in San Francisco’s low-income neighborhoods. Not surprising, the unemployment rate in San Francisco’s violence-prone neighborhoods is more than double the citywide unemployment rate. Research suggests victims and perpetrators are likely to be underemployed or unemployed. Studies also suggest there is an increased likelihood of probationer and parolee subsequent involvement with violence as a result of inadequate education and elevated rates of unemployment.

**POPULATIONS MOST AFFECTED BY VIOLENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO**

- **African Americans are consistently and disproportionately over-represented across all forms of violence.**
  African Americans are more likely to be victims of serious injury due to assault or homicide, and more likely to be identified as victims of child abuse, hate crime, domestic violence, and elder abuse than persons in any other ethnic group. Although African Americans represent less than 8% of San Francisco’s population, they account for 39% of hospitalizations due to assaults; almost 35% of domestic violence incidents reported to police; 54% of homicide victims, 53% of racially motivated hate crime victims, and nearly half (46%) of all children in San Francisco’s child welfare system.

- **Emancipated and transitional age youth are at heightened risk for becoming victims and perpetrators of violence particularly gun violence. Children and youth in the child welfare system are at greater risk for involvement in the criminal justice system.**
  Over the next 3 years, approximately 150 transitional age youth will emancipate from foster care. These youth are at high risk for unemployment, homelessness and involvement with the criminal justice system. It is estimated as many as 28% of these youth are already involved in the justice system. These youth are at increased risk for involvement with gun violence. A 2006 study of homicide victims found that nearly a quarter of homicide victims had been in foster care at some point in their lives. Almost an equal number of homicide suspects were involved in the foster care system as well.

- **Children who witness violence are more likely to perpetuate violence later in life.**
  Some estimates suggest between 5,000 and 11,000 children and youth are exposed to domestic violence each year in San Francisco. When school-based violence and community violence are factored in, this number is dramatically increased. There is a strong correlation between children who witness violence and later involvement in violence and/or crime. Some estimates report as many as 87% of adult perpetrators of violent crime witnessed violence in the home as children.
• **Women and girls are particularly vulnerable to becoming victims of violence and are increasingly perpetrators themselves.**
  
  In 2006, the WOMAN Inc. Crisis Line received more than 14,000 domestic violence related calls. Almost 20% of the calls were from non-English speakers, particularly Latina callers. During the same year, more than 4,300 calls were placed to 911. A large proportion of these calls were placed by African American callers. Nearly 40% of domestic violence acts are perpetrated by an intimate partner. These kinds of incidences rarely occur as an isolated event. One report found that an estimated 33% of police responses to domestic violence calls were repeat visits to the same location.

  Emerging trends and patterns indicate women and girls are increasingly the perpetrators of violence. The number of girls referred to the Juvenile Probation Department rose 17% from 2006 to 2007 and half of the girls in juvenile hall are there for a violent offense.

• **Probationers and Parolees at high risk for violence without support.**
  
  At any given time there are up to 8,000 San Francisco residents on adult probation. A large portion of these probationers are violent offenders. A recent audit of probationers living in the Western Addition area revealed the severity of support needs of this population: 68% had identified substance abuse issues, 65% were unemployed, 48% lacked a high school diploma or GED and 42% had children. Without sufficient support, this population is at enormous risk for returning to custody. For offenders paroled to San Francisco in 2006, more than 60% had been in custody more than once.

  Offenders are also at extremely high risk for being victims or perpetrators of violence. A recent study of non-fatal shootings found that 73.8% of suspects in shooting incidents were previously known to the criminal justice system, as were 53.4% of the victims. About half of both victims and offenders had been to jail or prison, and about three quarters were currently or had, in the past, been on probation.

  In 2006 nearly 2,071 youth were referred to probation; 53% of these youth were African American. More than 60% of these youth were transitional aged, 73% had prior contact with juvenile probation, and 43% were booked for violent related crimes.

• **LGBTQ community is at greater risk for violent hate crime victimization than other victims of hate crimes.**
  
  Statewide statistics show that the great majority of hate crime is violent. Close to three-quarters (74.8%) of hate crime offenses occur against people rather than property. Race/ethnic origin of victim is the biggest motivation for hate crime in California, but hate crime due to sexual orientation is more prevalent in San Francisco than statewide. Different hate crime motivations result in different types of violent crime. Hate crime targeting religious and ethnic groups typically involve damage to property, while hate crime targeted at the LGBTQ community is usually violence against the person.
• **Gang affiliation increases risk for involvement with violence.**

Researchers estimate San Francisco has 1,200 to 1,700 gang members. Approximately 48% of the homicides in 2004, 2005, and 2006 were reportedly gang-related. This demonstrates a small portion of the population is responsible for a significant portion of San Francisco homicides.

A 2002 report on gangs in San Francisco found that young people were most likely to join between 12 and 14 years of age. Their reasons for joining included money, protection, a friend was in a gang, fun, and to get respect. 52% of males indicated gang affiliation made them safer, 80% of gang members indicated a primary benefit of gang affiliation was access to guns/weapons and 34% of respondents indicated they had attacked someone with a weapon.

• **Seniors are vulnerable to abuse due to cultural, physical, and linguistic isolation – white elders affected most.**

There are approximately 106,000 seniors living in San Francisco, representing nearly 14% of the city’s population. The senior population is expected to increase substantially over the next 10-20 years. Many of San Francisco seniors are vulnerable to abuse due to cultural, physical, and linguistic isolation. Over half of the seniors in San Francisco reside alone, and nearly 30% are linguistically isolated. In 2006, there were 2,613 reports of elder abuse. Roughly 60% of those reports were substantiated.
Both nationally and in San Francisco, data quality on reported crime and violence is generally compromised by lack of uniform definitions, disparate collection methods, inadequate data collection systems, and under trained staff. Poor data quality undermines the City’s ability to develop sound data-driven policy, accurately identify service needs and gaps, direct resource allocations, and evaluate effectiveness. San Francisco has several exciting data projects underway to address data limitations, establish shared outcomes, streamline data collection, and create a sound IT infrastructure to collect and share data. SFSTAT, JUSTIS, and the Shared Youth Database are just a few examples. Some of these systems are decades in the making and still require adequate staffing and resources to fully implement and utilize for shared planning, shared decision making and shared evaluation. Reliable high-quality data is central to establish and maintain a vision that prioritizes data-driven policies to support sustainable violence prevention.

The City must focus not only on making improvements to its data systems and data quality, but must also establish legal mechanisms that allow for interagency data sharing. This level of coordination among city departments is central to targeting resource for the most vulnerable populations with attention to the individual. Efforts are currently underway with the City Attorney to break down the roadblocks that prevent information sharing at present.

San Francisco makes a significant investment in violence prevention each year, spending at least $60 million to fund programs for vulnerable residents and communities. As a result, the City is rich with services to
support positive outcomes for those most at-risk for being affected by violence. While more can be done to coordinate efforts to decrease duplication, increase effectiveness, and more responsibly allocate public resources, there are a number of existing innovative violence prevention and reduction efforts that show promise in reducing violence.

As part of the Violence Prevention Strategic Planning Initiative, the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice conducted a comprehensive assessment of existing efforts to inform the development of meaningful recommendations. Information was collected through the use of key informant interviews with City staff as well as through a review of source documents and web content. The information was organized into the ten core policy areas that have formed the underlying framework of the Plan. A summary highlighting some of the findings from this assessment is provided below.

**Employment**
The City's current efforts to consolidate policy, planning, resource allocation and oversight of workforce development programs and services under the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development (MOEWD) will increase the effectiveness of workforce development service delivery, eliminate duplicative services, and fill gaps in services. The legislation codifying this centralization mandates renewed attention on employment training; job creation, placement, and retention services; and career advancement in neighborhoods most impacted by poverty and violence. The City's One-Stop Centers and First Source Hiring programs are central to achieving this mandate, as are exploring strategies to train and connect vulnerable populations to employment opportunities in emerging industries such as Green Jobs.

**Housing**
For the first time in San Francisco’s history, Mayor Gavin Newsom initiated the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) and City partnership for Safe and Decent Public Housing, a landmark agreement that formally recognizes the mutual accountability between city departments and the SFHA on key issues such as public safety, healthy housing standards, human services, assistance in replacing obsolete housing (HOPE SF), and increased technology investment.

HOPE SF is the City’ signature affordable housing initiative designed to rebuild distressed public housing and increase affordable housing options for San Francisco residents. Specifically, HOPE SF will significantly change public housing by rebuilding 2,500 apartments for public housing residents and building 3,500 new market-rate and affordable homes on seven public housing sites. HOPE SF is multi-million dollar project designed to drastically change San Francisco public housing over the next decade.

The recent appointment of the multi-agency, interdisciplinary Public Housing Transition Team presents a timely and unique opportunity to tackle and implement immediate quality of life improvements at public housing sites that have been identified as essential to improving existing conditions for residents and preventing violence in public housing developments.

**Education**
The Mayor has initiated a formal agreement between the City and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) to institutionalize and augment the City’s commitment to its public schools. The Partnership for Achievement is designed to improve outcomes for public school students by crafting a menu of benefits and programs to recruit and retain the best educators; using local funds to expand support and enrichment services; increasing investment in early education, after school programming, collaborative wrap around services, and
violence prevention programs; and developing strategies to prepare students for the modern workforce.

In addition, the City and SFUSD have partnered on two critical school-based violence prevention efforts. The **Stay in School Coalition** is a multi-agency coalition of social service and law enforcement agencies in partnership with the school district with the mission to improve school attendance and reduce habitual and chronic truancy in San Francisco. This work is being advanced by the Department of Children Youth and Their Families in partnership with SFUSD to establish the **Center for Academic Reentry and Empowerment (CARE)** – a truancy reduction center.

**Secure Our Schools** is another interagency collaborative approach to increase school and community safety by focusing on the academic success of students most at-risk for academic failure, expulsion, and suspension. The partnership develops comprehensive intervention plans to support these students both in school and within their communities. Intervention Specialists at each of four school sites work with a caseload of 25 students to improve school attendance, performance, overall safety and sense of well-being.

**Reentry**

A multitude of reentry efforts demonstrate early promising results in helping to reduce recidivism. The **Women’s Reentry Center** provides gender specific services to women exiting the criminal justice system including assistance and referrals for housing, substance abuse programs, employment, medical and mental health services, and legal help. The Center also provides a variety of personal development classes such as computer training, parenting classes and financial literacy classes. Childcare, free clothing, a computer lab, and a food bank are also available resources.

The District Attorney’s **Back on Track** program couples strict accountability and close supervision with education, employment support and health care for young adult drug offenders. The **No Violence Alliance (NoVA)**, a collaboration among law enforcement and community non-profit organizations, provides case management and services to violent offenders released from jail or prison.

Additionally, a soon to be formed **Reentry Coordinating Council** will help align the work of San Francisco’s two existing reentry collaborative partnerships: the San Francisco Reentry Council led by District Attorney Kamala Harris and Sheriff Michael Hennessy and the San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Council led by Public Defender Jeff Adachi and Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi. While each Council continues its autonomous work focusing on a separate population group (local offenders vs. state parolees), the Coordinating Council will maximize resources, avoid duplication, and create clarity for clients accessing reentry services.

**Family Support and Senior Support**

The Human Services Agency contracts with seven neighborhood-based **Family Resource Centers** in different areas of the City to provide parent education, mentoring, case management and counseling services, along with child care and other activities which serve to strengthen families and improve the well-being of children. **Parent University**, a project of the Mayor’s Communities of Opportunity initiative modeled after the Harlem Children’s Zone, will provide a range of services from parenting classes, support groups, family fun nights, GED classes, community celebrations, crisis intervention, information and referral, and access to emergency funding. The **Family Ambassador Program**, developed by DCYF and Communities of Opportunity, supports a team of parents from Bayview Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley to reach out to the parents from these neighborhoods to connect them to available resources.

The **San Francisco Partnership for Community-Based Care & Support** is a network of more than 70 private and public organizations, working to improve community-based services for older adults and adults with disabilities in San Francisco. Since its formation in May 2004, the partnership has become an extensive network of service providers dedicated to strengthening the system of community-based care and support. This partnership is becoming the tangible, visible association of home and community-based long-term care and supportive services for older adults and adults with disabilities in San Francisco.

Established in 2000, **First 5 San Francisco** is part of the First 5 California statewide movement to assist public agencies, non-profit organizations and
families in supporting early education, pediatric healthcare, family support and systems change. In 2006, First 5 San Francisco completed its Strategic Plan 2007-2012, which reflected the information and input that was solicited from their inclusive planning process which involved hundreds of parents, caregivers, service providers, practitioners, funders and policy makers. The First 5 San Francisco Strategic Plan identified the initiative’s primary focus areas, which included 1) improved child health, 2) enhanced child development, 3) improved family functioning and 4) improved systems of care. To fully realize these goals, First 5 San Francisco has identified its service strategies, determined the allocation of fund, established an evaluation framework and methodology and initiated a Request for Proposals process to be implemented over the next five years.

Trauma Reduction
Witnessing or experiencing violence is directly correlated with future risk of violent behavior, and San Francisco has a number of longstanding initiatives designed to help individuals, families, and communities heal. SafeStart, a program of DCYF, seeks to reduce the incidence and impact of violence on children ages 6 and under by providing early intervention and treatment services to families exposed to violence, offering training and support to staff at points-of-service, and conducting policy advocacy and systems change work to promote coordinated and effective responses to childhood violence exposure.

The Department of Public Health’s Crisis Response Team (CRT), comprised of grief counselors and mental health practitioners respond to families within 24 hours after each homicide. They help families cope with the loss of loved ones and assist with funeral arrangements and victim services. The CRT works closely with the Crisis Response Network (CRN).

The Community Response Network (CRN) founded initially in the Mission District and now serving the entire city, provides crisis response when a violent incident has occurred; care management services and development; and street level outreach.

San Francisco General Hospital is home to three important trauma support resources for victims of violence. The Child and Adolescent Support Advocacy Resource Center (CASARC) serves children and adolescents (up to age 18) who have been sexually or physically abused or who have witnessed severe violence. Forensic medical and crisis management services are available 24 hours a day, and CASARC provides trauma-focused psychotherapy for individuals, groups and families. CASARC also provides educational trainings for community providers, including teachers, students, health care providers and mental health professionals who often suffer from vicarious or secondary trauma.

The Trauma Recovery Center (TRC/RTC) opened in August of 2001 to provide medical services for crime related injuries, supportive mental health and case management services to survivors of interpersonal violence. Types of trauma treated include domestic violence, sexual assaults and other physical assaults, criminal motor vehicle accidents, gang-related violence, and people who have lost a loved one to homicide.

The Wraparound Project is designed to break the cycle of violent injury in San Francisco. About 96% of violently injured individuals are treated at SFGH Level 1 trauma facility and an astounding 50% of them will return some time in the future, injured again. The Wraparound Project intervenes in this cycle by being there, at the individuals hospital bedside - a time when that individual is often motivated to explore ways of reducing his/her risk factors associated with violent injury. A host of supportive services are offered in partnership and collaboration with community based organizations.

The Victim Services branch of the District Attorney’s Office assists crime victims with a range of services including crisis counseling and intervention; emergency assistance; assistance in submitting claims for financial and property losses; orientation to the criminal justice system; updates on case status; notification of family, friends, and employers; and court escort and support.

Youth Empowerment
San Francisco has long been at the forefront of youth development programs and initiatives. The San Francisco Youth Commission is a group of 17 youth appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to ensure that young people have a role and a voice in the decisions being made at city hall.
In 2000, San Francisco voters approved the creation of the Youth Empowerment Fund which requires a minimum of 3% set-aside of the San Francisco Children’s Fund to support youth empowerment activities. Currently, the Fund dedicates approximately $1 million to supporting youth-led projects in San Francisco each year.

The Community Health Education Division of DPH launched YouthPOWER (Youth Peaceful Organizers Working to Enact Results) in 2000. It is a youth-led initiative aimed at reducing alcohol and marijuana use among middle and high school-age youth in San Francisco’s Bayview Hunters Point through environmental prevention strategies. The group has three primary goals: 1) increase neighborhood capacity to create an environment conducive to positive youth development; 2) promote positive mental health and reduce youth violence and substance use in the Bayview Hunters Point; 3) create a model for neighborhood/citywide planning that can be replicated and applied to other social, educational, economic, criminal justice and public health challenges.

Community Transformation and Empowerment
Social connectedness, resident involvement, and positive environmental changes can significantly promote safety and deter violent incidents. Community deterioration and lack of cohesiveness plague the City’s most violence prone neighborhoods. The San Francisco Safety Network, launched in 1996 by the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice, is a citywide partnership that utilizes 12 geographically-based community organizers to enhance community policing efforts in each police district and build the capacity of neighborhoods to reduce crime and increase public safety.

The Weed and Seed program is a federally-funded neighborhood-based strategy in both Visitacion Valley and Ingleside, designed to encourage residents to work with police to reduce crime and to bring in services to prevent crime and revitalize neighborhoods. The two-pronged strategy requires law enforcement agencies and prosecutors to cooperate to weed out violent criminals and drug abusers, and engages public agencies and community-based private organizations to collaborate to seed much-needed human services, including prevention, intervention, treatment, and neighborhood restoration programs. A community-oriented policing component bridges the weeding and seeding elements.

Additionally, San Francisco has established a series of Community Benefit Districts to fund improvements in specific neighborhoods including beautification projects, clean and safe programs, graffiti removal, tree maintenance, marketing and district promotions, and special events such as farmers markets and street festivals. Six Districts have been designated to date: Union Square, Castro/Upper Market, Noe Valley, Tenderloin/North Market, Mission Miracle Mile, Fisherman’s Wharf.

Community Policing
In November 2006, the San Francisco Police Department released a comprehensive report documenting current community policing practices and detailing ways in which the department had institutionalized community policing. These included appointing a Director of Community Policing within SFPD, convening monthly community meetings within each police district, community policing documentation and tracking of public safety issues raised at community meetings and events.
The Community Policing Advisory Committee is working to: 1) assess the strengths of community policing in San Francisco; 2) assess where changes are needed; 3) develop recommendations to improve and 4) report back to the Police Chief and the Police Commission with the assessment and recommendations. The CPAC is in the process of submitting the report and devising recommendations for next steps to implement community policing.

San Francisco is one of 13 major cities participating in the California Cities Gang Prevention Network, the first of its kind in the nation. This initiative aims to combat gang violence through increased collaboration among major cities, focusing on policy and program development by sharing best practices in prevention, intervention, and enforcement. The network facilitates strategic planning, capacity building and legislative advocacy to promote comprehensive strategies and alternatives to prison-only solutions.

**Firearms, Alcohol, and Drug Availability**

Legislation adopted by the City of San Francisco in early 2007 aims to limit the sale, purchase, and possession of firearms and ammunition in San Francisco. Some of these newly mandated conditions require licensed firearms dealers to transmit transaction records to the Police Department every six months, clearly post signage throughout their place of business that describes the prohibitions around the sale of firearms to certain individuals, and clearly identifies the consequences to licensees who are in breach of any City firearms mandate.

Targeting individuals who purchase firearms, recently introduced legislation requires that firearms located within a residence be kept in a locked container, prohibits the possession of firearms or ammunition on county property, and requires those convicted of gun related offenses register in a gun offender directory. By adopting this new legislation, the City strives to ensure the safety of the general public and specifically children, who are increasingly the perpetrators and victims of firearm related incidences.

In 2007 San Francisco hosted a series “Gifts for Guns” buy-back event. In an effort to get guns off the streets, authorities gave gifts cards to residents who turned in operable firearms. No photo ID or license was required and no questions were asked. The City plans to host more gun buy-back events as part of its larger violence prevention efforts, recognizing the value of the gun buy-back program when used in conjunction with other violence prevention strategies.

Mayor Gavin Newsom is a member of Mayors Against' Illegal Guns, a coalition led by New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, with over 250 mayors from around the country who are committed to preventing criminals from illegally obtaining guns and preventing those who do get them from using them. The mayors of the coalition have all pledged to prosecute crimes commissioned with the use of illegal guns, oppose federal efforts to restrict cities’ access to trace data, to develop technologies that aid in the detection of illegal guns, to support legislation that targets illegal guns, and to share information and best practices.

The Entertainment Commission works in conjunction with the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC) and the San Francisco Police Department to ensure that the sale of alcohol in places of entertainment is regulated and in compliance with local laws and to devise strategies to ensure the safe, violence-free, enjoyable assembly of residents and visitors in San Francisco.

Deemed Approved Off-Sale Alcohol Use Nuisance Regulations promote the public health, safety and general welfare of residents by requiring that businesses that sell alcoholic beverages for off site consumption have a permit that complies with a comprehensive set of Deemed Approved Performance Standards. There are other efforts underway with the creation of Alcohol Impact Areas. To begin, AIA will work with retail stores with off-site liquor sales licenses to limit the hours of sale for fortified alcohol and urge merchants to limit the sale of individual containers of fortified liquor.
San Francisco has a rich and diverse set of community agencies deeply committed to preventing violence and improving health outcomes for residents. These agencies carry out an immense amount of work on behalf of the City.

**FRAMEWORK**

The overarching vision of San Francisco’s Violence Prevention Plan is to create a violence-free environment for all San Franciscans and to sustain long-term reductions in the incidence and prevalence of violence citywide.

Three primary goals have been identified to achieve this vision. Each goal focuses on a different layer of the problem and combined provide a comprehensive framework for a new model of violence prevention for the City. Specific objectives have been identified for each goal and a number of strategic action steps are recommended within each objective. This section provides rationale for the framework and sketches out a plan for implementation. A chart depicting the organization of the framework is included at the end of this section.

**GOAL ONE: COORDINATE TO HARMONIZE THE WORK OF CITY AGENCIES SO THAT LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS MORE CAPABLE OF ACHIEVING VIOLENCE PREVENTION.**

While dozens of City agencies are actively engaged in a variety of violence prevention and reduction efforts, San Francisco needs a unified plan and a coherent, coordinated strategy. Efforts across agencies are disconnected from one another and there is no set of unifying goals that drive the planning and evaluation of these efforts. This is a significant problem because it
limits the City’s ability to collectively assess the problem, identify the strengths or weaknesses of existing efforts, identify gaps in the City’s programming, or effectively leverage resources. In order to achieve long-term, sustainable change, violence prevention must be a clear priority of the City as a whole and a structure must be in place for shared responsibility and coordination. Political will and bold leadership are the first priority to build momentum for this work. Once the policy priority is set, City agencies need to work together in a different way, participating in an interagency structure that allows for coordinated analysis, planning, evaluation, and accountability of violence prevention initiatives. Mayor Newsom recently appointed a new Violence Prevention Director and has initiated this work by creating an Interagency Council (IAC) and codifying legislation establishing the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC). Building on these efforts, City agencies will continue developing a comprehensive plan for sustained implementation to ensure long-term success.

GOAL TWO: INVEST MORE STRATEGICALLY TO INCREASE THE COMMUNITY’S CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE VIOLENCE PREVENTION IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY.

San Francisco has a rich and diverse set of community agencies deeply committed to preventing violence and improving health outcomes for residents. These community agencies carry out an immense amount of work on behalf of the City. They are the job placement specialists, mentors, outreach workers, counselors, case managers, healers, and supporters for so many of our at-risk residents. The challenge in San Francisco is that we as a City have no unified strategy for ensuring that the community-level work is operating at its best and highest capacity. There are many community programs, but few anchor institutions with high-level skills and capacity to successfully carry out the difficult goals we set out for our community partners. Significant capacity-building improvements are necessary to create a more effective, substantive, and comprehensive network of community programs and services. Examples include: providing intensified training for CBOs and sufficient technical assistance to build the infrastructure of organizations and allow CBOs to operate effectively, increasing coordination between agencies to provide a continuum of care for entire families, enhancing outreach and education to community residents, developing uniform performance standards to ensure effectiveness, and providing neighborhood-focused, geographically-specific programming.

GOAL THREE: HOLD CITY AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES ACCOUNTABLE FOR ACHIEVING CONCRETE, SHORT AND LONGER TERM, MEASURABLE OUTCOMES IN 10-KEY POLICY AREAS.

In addition to developing a coherent citywide structure and building community capacity for service delivery, San Francisco needs to set results-oriented, outcome goals for the most important violence prevention policy priorities. Ten priority areas have emerged in the planning process as the most critical places to focus San Francisco's violence prevention efforts. The ten areas are: workforce development, housing, education, youth empowerment, community engagement, family support, re-entry, trauma reduction, community policing; and firearm, alcohol, and drug availability. There are existing efforts in various departments and in many San Francisco neighborhoods already working to achieve improved outcomes in many of these areas. As a City however, we need to agree on the outcome indicators for the priority areas, collectively embrace the best of the existing efforts in place to achieve these outcomes; and work together to develop new initiatives in areas where no coherent effort already exists.

Given current levels of violence in San Francisco, it is necessary to implement a series of short-term triage strategies to mitigate the immediate crisis. At the same time, the Interagency Council and Violence Prevention Advisory Committee must agree on baseline measures, set outcome targets, and prioritize strategies for each of the ten core policy areas.
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The chart on the previous page organizes the three goals and 20 objectives of the Plan into a framework that is comprehensive and multifaceted.

**PLAN OF ACTION**

Given the scope and nature of the problem, a comprehensive strategy is best executed in phases to have the most impact and success. A phased approach will enable San Francisco to continue its current violence prevention efforts, prepare adequately for proposed changes, and institutionalize systems improvements such as data sharing, coordinated decision making, and evaluation that require time and significant effort to develop. In addition, a phased approach will enable ongoing planning and policy development so that the plan can be fluid and responsive as action steps are implemented and progress evaluated.

The Plan is organized into three sections corresponding to each of the three goals, described on the previous page. A detailed summary of the rationale for each objective is provided along with a list of recommended action steps. The information contained herein is intended to serve as a starting point to guide initial implementation. A work plan outlining each of the objectives, action steps, timeline, and parties responsible is included in Section V of this document.

**GOAL ONE: COORDINATE TO HARMONIZE THE WORK OF CITY AGENCIES SO THAT LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS MORE CAPABLE OF ACHIEVING VIOLENCE PREVENTION.**

Five objectives were identified to achieve the goal of developing a coordinated citywide structure for violence prevention in San Francisco. Combined, these objectives aim to improve how San Francisco agencies make decisions, work together, allocate violence prevention resources, share information, and evaluate programs and services.

**Objective 1.1 Prioritize Violence Prevention.**

Evidence from other cities around the country demonstrates that bold political leadership is a requisite for successful violence prevention. A strong directive for action and a codified mandate can provide the foundation for citywide change. It is also necessary to create a coordinated violence prevention leadership structure to enable city departments and cooperating agencies to work together, leverage resources, make collective-decisions, and hold one another accountable in addressing the problem.

In San Francisco, it is essential for the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and other elected and appointed officials to unite around the issue and champion the violence prevention plan. By issuing a clear, unwavering political directive that declares violence prevention one of the City’s most important priorities, the Mayor has set the stage for the significant changes that must occur. The directive requires the full support and cooperation of all city departments and cooperating agencies (including the SFUSD, the SF Housing Authority, and the San Francisco Police Department), and urges the City to leverage all available resources (both financial and human capital) to effectively address the problem. The directive and this Plan have been codified into legislation by the Mayor establishing a Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) to implement the recommendations outlined in this Plan. The Interagency Council (IAC), established by Mayor Newsom in May 2008, will lead the City’s violence prevention efforts to ensure that strategies transcend ever-shifting political trends, agencies collaborate and remain in place, independent of inevitable leadership transitions.

The Mayor has appointed a new Violence Prevention Director to act as the chairperson of the VPAC and to facilitate interagency collaboration and cooperation to carry out his vision to better serve the City’s vulnerable populations. The Violence Prevention Director will guide and facilitate the implementation of the plan, under the direction of the Mayor and in coordination with all city and community agencies involved in violence prevention.
Action Step 1.1.a: Issue an executive directive that declares violence a health crisis that must be addressed through concentrated and strategic interagency efforts, community investments, and widespread public education (completed).

Action Step 1.1.b: Enact legislation to establish and codify a Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) under the governance of the recently established Interagency Council (IAC), tasked with streamlining the City’s violence prevention efforts, information sharing, identifying shared measurable outcomes, and holding agencies accountable for measuring and achieving these outcomes (underway by Mayor).

Action Step 1.1.c: Appoint a Director of Violence Prevention to lead all aspects of violence prevention policy development, planning, coordination and implementation of San Francisco violence prevention efforts using the Plan as a blueprint (completed).

Action Step 1.1.d: Convene the Interagency Council and Violence Prevention Advisory Committee to facilitate citywide coordination and oversee implementation of the Violence Prevention Plan (in progress).

Action Step 1.1.e: Partner with state and federal officials to craft and support anti-violence legislation, advocate for the support of violence prevention efforts, and garner new resources.

Objective 1.2 Establish Mandated Coordination and Collaboration Across City Agencies.

The City’s current violence prevention efforts are vast, yet limited coordination exists across agencies. There is no shared definition of violence prevention and no formal mechanism by which city agencies plan or evaluate strategies together. This results in inefficiencies, duplication in the allocation of funding and in the delivery of services, lack of effective CBO partnerships and collaborations, and inadequate impact on the overall problem.

Mayor Gavin Newsom recently established the Interagency Council (IAC), the entity charged with ensuring that the City begins to work together in a more organized and coordinated way to enable the development of common definitions and outcomes, the leveraging of resources, the linking of existing violence prevention and intervention efforts, and joint planning for future programs and services. The Violence Prevention Advisory Committee, codified by the Mayor in June 2008, was created to focus specifically on implementation
of the recommendations outlined in the plan. The creation of these bodies will increase the City’s capacity for cooperative planning and decision-making, allowing for identification and replication of best and promising local and national practices, and for adopting metrics to validate effectiveness that ultimately result in improved violence prevention and reduction outcomes.

Emphasis must be placed on developing more consistent linkages between the City’s human service agencies and law enforcement institutions in particular. The Plan includes strategies that range from primary prevention to intervention and response/law enforcement, and the City must come together to coordinate efforts across this continuum of prevention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVENTION</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td>Immediate Action</td>
<td>Longer-Term Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence has occurred</td>
<td>violence has occurred</td>
<td>violence to deal with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to prevent initial perpetration and victimization</td>
<td>to deal with short-term consequences</td>
<td>lasting consequences and treatment consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action Step 1.2.a: Develop and adopt uniform definitions for prevention, intervention, and response.

Action Step 1.2.b: Develop and update an inventory of violence prevention programs and services for all City agencies and departments on a regular basis to serve as a resource guide and tool for coordinated planning.

Action Step 1.2.c: Require City agencies to include violence prevention strategies in their strategic plans.

Action Step 1.2.d: Identify and replicate best practices and fill gaps in services.

Action Step 1.2.e: Conduct an annual performance review to monitor implementation, document progress, and make improvements to the Violence Prevention Plan.

Objective 1.3 Develop Shared Outcomes to Measure Accountability.
As a City, we need shared goals. We need to hold ourselves accountable to outcomes that will lead to less violence. Recidivism rates, truancy rates, graduation rates, and employment rates are all examples of outcome measures that must drive our work. We need to agree together on a set of outcomes that help our residents and ensure that public funds are being used efficiently and responsibly. We need clear measures by which we are evaluating the City’s violence prevention programs and services to ensure they are effective. Understanding the current scope of the problem, establishing baseline markers for evaluation, and developing minimum quality standards across city agencies
for city-funded programs are essential to measuring success. Systems for data collection and analysis are necessary and mechanisms for reporting the results must be in place. Programs and strategies deemed ineffective and wasteful should be eliminated. Funded programs must be able to demonstrate a return on tax-payer investment.

Creating a set of standards that establish expectations for all prevention, intervention, and suppression efforts will promote high quality service delivery citywide, shift the focus from activities to outcomes, and enable meaningful evaluations that compare like information. DCYF is spearheading a minimum standards initiative for their funded programs based on nationally accepted principles and their work in this area is an important first step that can inform this process.

Once standards are adopted they should be used as the basis for an annual review of city-funded violence prevention and intervention services. The results of the program assessment will document the extent to which existing services are meeting or exceeding minimum standards, note the areas in which grantees are receiving support from the city agencies that fund them to achieve these standards, and identify areas of improvement at the city and community level that are necessary to help programs and services better align with the standards. Additionally, the baseline standards should become part of the City’s Request for Proposal (RFP) process for selecting grantees and should help guide the training and technical assistance provided to both city staff and community-based organizations.

Action Step 1.3.a: Establish and adopt uniform baseline performance outcomes.

Action Step 1.3.b: Establish and adopt minimum quality standards for the City’s violence prevention, intervention, and response programs.

Action Step 1.3.c: Ensure shared outcomes are tracked by all relevant data collection systems.

**Objective 1.4 Align Resources to Support Shared Outcomes.**

With over a $6 billion budget, San Francisco is undeniably a resource rich municipality. Conservative estimates suggest that about $60 million of the budget is funding violence prevention efforts. However, without a clear method to effectively track, assess, align and leverage these resources, San Francisco is not able to ensure that these dollars are being spent effectively, that they are having their intended impact, or that they are being managed in a way that allows for additional funds to come in through outside sources.

To effectively mitigate violence, leaders must commit to aligning existing city resources and begin to maximize diverse funding sources that exist outside the City budget. Potential funding could include CalWorks/TANF, WIA, CDBG and HOME funds, to name a few. The idea is not to usurp these dollars into a violence prevention fund, but to consider how to strategically align and leverage these resources as an explicit violent crime and homicide prevention tactic. In addition, the need to streamline, coordinate and centralize the identification of shared outcomes for violence prevention programs is necessary.

Creating a set of standards that establish expectations for all prevention, intervention, and suppression efforts will promote high quality service delivery citywide, shift the focus from activities to outcomes, and enable meaningful evaluations that compare like information.
and procurement of funding for new violence prevention and intervention is essential.

Accurate budget projections depend on good estimates of the types of services provided and the number of people served. Tracking services, people served, and associated costs will allow the City to better determine the cost of individual programs and services and compare them to the intended outcomes and benefits to be achieved. Research demonstrates that the programs with the most successful outcomes are those that involve long-term, intense, multifaceted interventions. It takes years to overcome the negative influences of disadvantaged neighborhoods, dysfunctional families, poor school performance, and delinquent peer groups. It is necessary, therefore, to make a realistic commitment to violence prevention and to recognize that the required resources are significant, must be sustained over time, and must prioritize primary prevention – efforts to prevent the on-set of violence before it ever occurs.

Investing in primary prevention is particularly important given that the bulk of the limited resources currently allocated to combat violence are utilized for intervention and response. While focusing more on prevention may require new investments initially, it will ultimately result in cost savings and long-term benefits. Strategic realignment and more tactical deployment of existing resources are other options to support primary prevention. In addition, investments in evaluation, data and information sharing, and training are important and necessary to build the infrastructure and systems for long-term, sustainable change.

Finally, the way that City departments currently contract with community organizations is often fragmented which exacerbates the problem of violence. A single community-based agency can potentially receive funding from multiple city sources, yet no centralized system exists to execute or manage these contracts. Pooling resources and making joint funding decisions would have a more significant impact on violence prevention efforts. Developing a centralized means to track city contracts, monitor performance, and standardize reporting would ensure more accountability, increase efficiency, and provide consistent measures for evaluation. The Controller’s Office Joint Monitoring Program is a promising new practice that should be embraced and expanded. This program seeks to coordinate fiscal and compliance monitoring across agencies that fund community based organizations. There are currently nine agencies involved in the project. This could be expanded to include program evaluation as well as fiscal and compliance monitoring.

**Action Step 1.4.a:** Inventory current violence prevention funding by agency. Map/matrix violence prevention resources geographically, by target population, by department, and by funding source (underway by Budget Office).

**Action Step 1.4.b:** Review budget to monitor appropriations for violence prevention, intervention, and response, and guide budget development for the City.
Action Step 1.4.c: Identify and assess available funding sources to support violence prevention including, but not limited to: CalWorks, PAES, CDBG, Children’s Fund, Prop 36, First Five, Law Enforcement Resources, Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Prop 63, and HOME funds (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.4.d: Establish protocol to require all city agencies and department to demonstrate leveraging of violence prevention resources. Create a master calendar of the City’s RFP/grant making processes (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.4.e: Establish protocol to require all city agencies and departments to collaborate on new grant solicitations (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.4.f: Centralize the solicitation and procurement of new resources (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.4.g: Establish protocol that requires city departments to collaborate in developing annual budgets based on data generated from new performance standards (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.4.h: Integrate measurable outcomes and minimum compliance standards into City grant making processes (underway by MOCI).

Objective 1.5 Evaluate through Shared Data and Information Systems.

To measure the success of our shared efforts, we need data collection and analysis to be uniform, consistent, and shared across agencies. In alignment with national best practices, violence prevention policy initiatives and funding decisions must be data-driven to ensure measurable and sustained outcomes that are results-oriented. In addition to creating baseline measures mentioned above, the City must develop systems to evaluate its programs and share information and data between agencies and departments to facilitate coordination and ensure the delivery of high, quality targeted services. At the same time it is essential to balance the need for information sharing with privacy concerns. Therefore strict confidentiality protocols must be implemented.

There are already several efforts underway to enhance data tracking, sharing, and analysis across the city. These efforts need to be fully embraced, adopted, and adequately resourced by the City. The JUSTIS (Justice Information System) project is designed to streamline and modernize the data collection and utilization processes for the City’s entire criminal justice system. The Shared Youth Database was established in 2000 to integrate data from three major service systems: mental health, juvenile probation, and child welfare and is updated quarterly with information on mental health services, involvement with the juvenile justice system, and out-of-home placements for all youth served in each system. San Francisco's National Violent Injury Reporting
System captures information about every firearm related injury in San Francisco into a single database. Efforts are underway to expand the system to include information about all other violent death cases as well.

In addition to supporting the ongoing development of data systems and identifying the need for additional information technologies, it is important to invest resources in program evaluation to increase our understanding about services that work and help direct resources toward these activities. Effective evaluation includes both outcome evaluation—results and changes that occurred from a specific program, and process evaluation—information about how the program was implemented. Requiring an evaluation set-aside for all city-funded program and policy initiatives is one idea to ensure that information on process and outcomes is collected and analyzed to inform program and service improvements. Data will also be useful to inform the annual budget and other funding decisions.

Action Step 1.5.a: Evaluate through Shared Data and Information Systems.

Action Step 1.5.b: Complete the development and implementation of the JUSTIS technology project (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 1.5.c: Develop shared data agreements and confidentiality protocols. Consider Shared Youth Database as a model.

Action Step 1.5.d: Provide training to city staff and CBO staff on data collection, reporting, and evaluation.

Action Step 1.5.e: Adequately staff and resource JUSTIS (San Francisco’s National Violent Death Review System) and the Shared Youth Database.

Action Step 1.5.f: Create evaluation protocols for City grantees and prioritize needs.

Action Step 1.5.g: Partner with an independent entity to complete an annual evaluation of city funded programs and help shape guidelines and expectations around future funding opportunities.

Action Step 1.5.h: Use data generated from evaluation and performance reviews to inform budget and other funding decisions.

Action Step 1.5.i: Analyze and report out quarterly progress toward benchmarks, the status of implementation, and fidelity to minimum standards.
GOAL TWO: INVEST MORE STRATEGICALLY TO INCREASE THE COMMUNITY’S CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE VIOLENCE PREVENTION IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY.

Five violence prevention objectives have been identified to help build community capacity. These objectives combine to create a stronger, more effective, and coordinated continuum of programming for San Francisco’s residents that results in community transformation.

Objective 2.1 Define and Adopt Shared Principles for Community Transformation.

Numerous city agencies fund dozens of community-based organizations (CBOs) to carry out a tremendous amount of the City’s violence prevention and community services work. These CBOs are responsible for a huge variety of programs, from school-based programs, to family counseling, street outreach, job training, and much more. These CBOs are an integral part of San Francisco’s efforts to prevent violence and lift communities up.

Unfortunately, the City has lacked a uniform plan for transforming at-risk communities. What is the end goal for our community services work? How are we agreeing to achieve community transformation? How do our investments reflect our priorities?

The City as a whole needs to define and adopt shared principles for community transformation. We need to agree on our priorities and ensure that our investments match those priorities. We need to hold both City agencies and community agencies funded by the city accountable for carrying out work that is aligned with our shared principles and priorities.

Defining and adopting shared principles for community transformation will allow us to have a shared understanding at both the city and community levels. Community agencies will be able to place their work in the context of a larger Citywide framework and city agencies will be able to match their funding decisions and program evaluation with the City’s shared principles.

Community transformation is about a shift in the paradigms that guide both city and community work. We need paradigms that prioritize building bridges across strategies, streamlining processes to make system navigation user-friendly, making partnerships central to achieving outcomes, using real-time information and data to flexibly address emerging issues, and strengthening the relationship between community and city efforts.

Communities of Opportunity (COO) is a model example of a program seeking to transform the way city and community strategies can achieve measurable results. COO’s vision is to redesign how government addresses community issues using a multi-faceted, comprehensive approach to create social and economic opportunities for San Francisco’s most at-risk communities. The Plan embraces the COO vision and aims to strengthen the City’s capacity to embrace this vision by reengineering the way city agencies work together to solve problems and work with CBOs to deliver high quality services that help transform lives.

Action Step 2.1.a: Convene joint meetings with the Interagency Council and the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee to define and adopt shared principles of community transformation. These discussions should begin with the existing vision for COO and HOPE SF.

Action Step 2.1.b: Disseminate shared definition and principles with all City agencies and community-based organizations, and integrate definitions into training and grant making processes.
Action Step 2.1.c: Provide training to City and community staff about practices, policies, and philosophies that support these principles to enhance existing programs and integrate in the development of new programs.

Action Step 2.1.d: Establish protocol that requires adherence to transformation principles in all new requests for proposals (RFPs) and funding decisions that impact vulnerable populations.

Objective 2.2 Develop a Coordinated Services Delivery System that Serves the Whole Family and is Neighborhood-based.

Despite the wide array of services available to at-risk and low-income residents in San Francisco, the services delivery system as a whole tends to be disconnected and opaque. Families are often served by more than one city agency or CBO and those agencies are often not aware of the other agencies’ efforts. Additionally, a family or youth may have multiple case managers or other service providers who are unaware of each other because service delivery is fragmented and information is not adequately shared. There is limited coordinated focus on geographic regions of the City, so strategies that may be working in one neighborhood may not be effectively reaching other neighborhoods.

The Plan calls for overhauling services to align them with achieving specific results for targeted geographic regions and measurable outcomes for entire families, not just individuals. Without a holistic, wraparound approach to families and communities, the effectiveness of services can be lost. Limiting duplication of services and strengthening the effectiveness of services through multi-agency collaboration will help city and community agencies join together to achieve outcomes for families and communities without squandering resources.

A priority is to develop the capacity to collectively identify at-risk families and provide a continuum of seamless services that are appropriate for each stage of a family’s development. Coordination between providers is essential to more effectively serve clients. A model of coordinated planning across city agencies and community providers that could evolve and be modified over time needs to be developed.

The City needs to target services strategically, prioritizing geographic areas with the highest level of violence and coordinating service delivery to achieve measurable outcomes for entire communities.

Action Step 2.2.a: Create a comprehensive list of services throughout the City that can serve as a resource guide for service providers and outreach workers.

Action Step 2.2.b: Create maps of hot spot areas and issues these areas face to assess service needs and inform service delivery and coordinated case management.
Action Step 2.2.c: Develop a coordinated service delivery model to reduce duplication of efforts, and coordinate information sharing that will be responsive to neighborhood needs and serve the whole family (underway by COO).

Action Step 2.2.d: Develop MOUs and clear protocols for data sharing among City agencies and service providers to support coordinated case management with attention to privacy and confidentiality issues.

Objective 2.3 Unify and Strengthen Training and Capacity Building for both City and Community.

Although San Francisco has hundreds of community-based organizations (CBOs) and a general commitment to supporting community-based programming, the City lacks a unified standard for ensuring the quality and strength of the community-based efforts we fund. We need to significantly alter the manner in which we invest in community-based organizations to ensure that both city and community agencies are trained in best practices for achieving community transformation and that our programs are operating at capacity to achieve the outcomes we desire.

Healthy organizations and institutions are those with a solid administrative infrastructure, fiscal solvency, strong and consistent leadership, a professional and engaged board of directors, ties with community, ongoing staff training and professional development, structured policies and procedures, and clearly identified measurable outcomes that are understood by leadership and program staff alike and that are regularly tracked and evaluated.

Many CBOs struggle to maintain their programs and retain staff, suffer from a lack of adequate training, have difficulty securing or keeping functional and affordable office space, experience difficulty navigating the complicated city bureaucracies funding, and reporting mechanisms, and they lack incentive to work in collaboration with one another. Simultaneously, these agencies deal with often traumatic and intense community problems without adequate resources, professional skills, or cultural competency. Also, despite the intensity of the community issues CBOs handle, they often struggle to demonstrate their best practices or share the stories from their daily experiences in ways that shape or inform public policy.

San Francisco needs to transform its training and capacity-building practices to professionalize and strengthen community services. The City needs to: adopt uniform mechanisms for accurately assessing the actual cost of providing services at the community level (including infrastructure, training, staff retention, and professional operational costs); fund community agencies at a level that matches actual cost; train both city and community agencies in best practices and institution-building; and, work with community agencies to effectively evaluate the impact of their services so that strategies can be adjusted and improved based on a clear analysis of what is working and what is not.

Fortunately, there are a number of existing capacity-building and training initiatives that are currently underway. Communities of Opportunity (COO) launched an intensive capacity building effort with their Neighborhood Benefit Organizations Institute. DCYF is engaged in ongoing capacity building for its grantees. The Community Response Network (CRN) is engaged in cross training and skills building for its team of street outreach workers. The Street Intervention Coalition, the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, the Safety Network, and the Family Support Network are all engaged in ongoing and upcoming capacity-building and training projects aimed at significantly strengthening our community-based organizations’ work. The Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD) is strengthening capacity and leadership in the community. These efforts are laying the foundation for a uniform citywide approach.
Action Step 2.3.a: Centralize planning, coordination, and implementation of the City’s capacity building efforts to build community institutions that are able to operate at capacity and the highest skills level.

Action Step 2.3.b: Conduct a formal assessment of all existing capacity-building and training efforts, identify gaps, and develop plans to fill gaps.

Action Step 2.3.c: Develop a uniform mechanism by which all City grantees are trained and supported in professional development and continued education for violence prevention.

Action Step 2.3.d: Make the City funding and reporting procedures uniform, clear and user-friendly for all community-based organizations (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 2.3.e: Require agencies to complete specific training to meet qualifications for city funding, including training on evaluation techniques. Consider using the COO Neighborhood Benefit Organization (NBO) Institute as a model.

Action Step 2.3.f: Jointly monitor grantee compliance with contract requirements, including minimum performance standards, program quality standards, and basic operational principles, such as insurance and fiscal compliance. Expand the Controller’s Joint Monitoring Project (underway by Controller’s Office).

Action Step 2.3.g: Include grantees in planning around evaluation protocols and shared data efforts including training to effectively collect, input, analyze and report data on participation and other variables.

Action Step 2.3.h: Link Anchor Institutions, Family Resource Centers and neighborhood multi-service center concepts, planning, and funding to avoid duplication. Support the launch of these efforts in affected communities once there is clarity about service delivery responsibilities.

Objective 2.4 Strengthen Public and Private Investments in the Unified Delivery System and Training.

San Francisco is home to an impressive network of foundations, individual donors, and corporate sponsors. These investors are committed to strengthening San Francisco’s communities and improving the quality of life for all residents. Philanthropic and corporate investments in programs, services, and capacity building are a significant resource to the City and its residents. As critical as these resources are to enhancing CBOs and contributing to community development and violence prevention strategies, these private investments often happen independent of the City’s resource allocation. Developing a strong public private partnership to align resources to support violence prevention and coordinated case management is integral to the success of the Plan’s comprehensive approach. Like CBOs, the work of private partners should also be aligned within the larger vision of coordination. Establishing a forum and regular meeting schedule will strengthen the public/private partnerships that already exist, identify new opportunities, and reprogram efforts deemed ineffective. These efforts, many underway by the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD) will encourage further investment by private sector collaborative partners, providing a clear assessment of need and impact of their contribution.
Objective 2.5 Strengthen Community Outreach Strategies and Community Connectivity.

Street outreach is a commonly understood practice that can help reduce violence and prevent it from occurring. It is a vital component to reaching individuals who are often disconnected from mainstream services, but often involved in various city or county systems such as child protective services, criminal justice, public housing, and welfare. It can also help build ties between traditionally marginalized communities and systems where there is long-standing mistrust.

Outreach workers meet at-risk individuals where they are (in their homes, on the street, and within locked institutions) and connect them to services and resources, mediate conflicts, and intervene to prevent retaliation. Outreach is most successful when workers are from the neighborhoods they are serving, can relate to the experiences of the population they are outreaching to, are respected by both youth and adults in the community, have changed their own lives and behaviors, and lead by example. Strong relationships between service providers and outreach workers are necessary so that a range of services and resources and alternatives are available for referral.

San Francisco is on the forefront of outreach initiatives with the Crisis Response Network, Community Conveners, Community Builders, and the Safety Network. However, these efforts could be better coordinated to have an even more significant impact on overall outcomes.

Action Step 2.4.a: Convene a funder’s circle to identify policy, service, and program needs, funding and in-kind support opportunities.

Action Step 2.4.b: Integrate private investors into annual budgeting process to align public and private investments. Funding decisions should be data driven.

Action Step 2.4.c: Centralize the City’s process of grant solicitation, review, and procurement under the Office of Community Investment (underway by MOCI).

Action Step 2.4.d: Strengthen the involvement of key stakeholders such as the Chamber of Commerce and key trade associations. Connect successful models.

Action Step 2.4.e: Coordinate City grant making and compliance processes so that they are uniform and strategic across City agencies and more efficient and effective for community agencies. Expand MOCI compliance model (underway by MOCI).
In addition, while appropriate services, responsive institutions, and coordinated outreach efforts are important components in the effort to prevent violence, community involvement is an essential element to generating and sustaining long-term change.

Action Step 2.5.a: Coordinate existing City-funded outreach efforts to
1) assign clear roles and responsibilities for the work and
2) establish clear protocols for making referrals to programs.

Action Step 2.5.b: Plan community outreach events in partnership with key agencies.

Action Step 2.5.c: Convene a regular coordinating meeting of representatives from existing outreach efforts.

GOAL THREE: HOLD CITY AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES ACCOUNTABLE FOR ACHIEVING CONCRETE, SHORT AND LONGER TERM, MEASURABLE OUTCOMES IN 10-KEY POLICY AREAS.

Ten policy areas emerged in the planning process as the most critical places to focus violence prevention efforts in San Francisco. The goal is to improve outcomes in each of these ten areas. However, in the short-term the City must adopt a triage strategy to realistically respond to the existing crisis at hand.

For this reason, the Plan outlines measurable outcomes in two phases, short-term triage and longer-term initiatives. In the short-term, the aim is to elevate and strengthen burgeoning efforts to strategically work on the most at-risk individuals and families to avert the likelihood of violence. Over the long-term, a number of recommendations have been suggested to improve existing systems, conditions for residents most at-risk, and ultimately reduce rates of violence through prevention.

SHORT-TERM TRIAGE

Significant restructuring and realignment needs to happen across city and community agencies to truly achieve violence prevention – this shift will develop over a period of time, but the City cannot lose sight of the need for immediate action steps that can alleviate some of the violence in communities.

Data on patterns of violence and victimization indicate that there are two specific sub-populations that face the greatest odds for being involved in violence: individuals already on adult probation or parole, and youth and their families already involved in the overlapping child welfare systems (dependency, delinquency, and welfare). The immediate triage strategy will focus on interventions for these two population groups to minimize the likelihood for involvement in violence.

Two efforts, chaired by MOCJ in collaboration with the city’s social service and law enforcement agencies, have laid the groundwork for this strategic
intervention. The first effort, Call-In Strategy, is an engagement strategy for adult probationers and parolees. Modeled after successful efforts in Boston and Chicago, it combines strong law enforcement with intensive supervision, case management, and wrap around services. The second effort, the Summer Street Violence Prevention Council, identified the most at-risk youth and their families in the city based on their current involvement in child welfare systems.

The Call-In Strategy is a collaborative effort of law enforcement, social service agencies, and community service providers to “call-in” individuals identified by city data to be highest risk and greatest need. These individuals are provided opportunities to address a multitude of barriers that often prevent them from achieving self sufficiency through legal means. These opportunities are coupled with a heavy handed message from community members and law enforcement that there is zero tolerance for violent behavior in the community and there will be harsh consequences if such behavior continues. This multi-agency initiative has demonstrated early promising results. For example, the Western Addition experienced a dramatic decline in violence after the Western Addition Call-In session took place in June 2007, resulting in the safest summer since 2003.

The second effort, the Summer Street Violence Prevention Council, was convened in June 2007 to respond to a wave of youth crime that rocked the city. This committee met to identify burgeoning issues in hot spot areas. The Council provided immediate crisis intervention, and through the efforts of the Human Services Agency, identified the most at-risk youth and their families in the city based on their current involvement in the overlapping child welfare systems. The data illustrated that the highest need and most at-risk youth and families live in five primary San Francisco neighborhoods – Bayview, Visitation Valley, Western Addition, Mission, and Tenderloin. These communities also have the highest rates of violence and highest rates of poverty.

Bayview and Visitation Valley are consistently and disproportionately impacted by all risk indicators. Data reveals 70% of males and 44% of females residing in Bayview have juvenile justice involvement by age 18. Thirty-one percent of all San Francisco foster children live in Bayview. Furthermore, Bayview has the largest number of children receiving welfare in San Francisco, and it is home to the greatest proportion of public housing in the city.

The individuals and families who are in crisis or near crisis are known to the City. Often these families are involved in multiple systems – child welfare, probation, and cash aid - answering to three or more case managers and struggling with many issues including substance abuse, unemployment, illiteracy, and poverty to turn their lives around.

The Violence Prevention Plan (VPP) proposes creating coordinated case management teams to address the variety of issues any one family may be facing and the development of a single case plan that supports an entire family through its transformation. This model has been successful in other U.S. cities and San Francisco has all of the requisite components for success: geographic focus, shared database, political will, community commitment and City/community partnership.

The Plan proposes that these promising efforts become solidified, strengthened, and embraced as the short-term triage strategy for violence prevention. Specifically, triage recommendations include:

• Embrace the Call-In Strategy as an intervention strategy with focus on institutionalizing geographically assigned, community supervision teams for probationers.

• Develop a new child welfare systems coalition to develop coordinated case management for youth and their families involved in multiple systems.
• Create a widespread anti-violence public education campaign with a broad community message in support of these efforts and to stimulate change of cultural norms about violence.

In addition to strategic intervention for the most at-risk, the Plan aims in the short term to begin the data and information sharing across agencies that will lay the foundation for achieving the long-term outcomes. To stimulate data sharing, the plan proposes the following action steps:

• Create Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) for data and information sharing across social service departments and law enforcement agencies with attention to protecting privacy rights.

• Lay the foundation for longer term strategies (such as the interagency working group, established to begin shared planning, shared evaluation, streamlined grant processes and grant solicitations, etcetera).

**5-YEAR POLICY OBJECTIVES**

**Objective 3.1 Create Career Paths for At-risk Communities.**

Poverty and poor education are significant risk factors that contribute to violence. Lack of employment opportunities and poor education perpetuate poverty. Together this tends to create a sense of hopelessness and desperation for individuals and communities, and contributes to violent behavior. It is not uncommon for those who are unable to get and maintain jobs making an adequate or living wage to turn to drug dealing or other illegal activities as a means of making money. The world of drug dealing and the associated underground street economy often perpetuate violence because of turf and power issues. Additionally, the lack of a high school education is the biggest contributor to unemployment. It is not surprising that the cyclical effects of poverty, unemployment, and poor education ravage the neighborhoods most affected by violence. Renewed attention must be placed on creating employment ladders for individuals most at risk for being unemployed, uneducated, or involved in drug sales.

San Francisco has enacted historic legislation centralizing workforce development, planning, policy development and resource allocation within the Mayor’s Office of Workforce and Economic Development (MOEWD) with a focus on employment services for neighborhoods struggling with poverty and violence.

**Action Step 3.1.a:** Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.

**Action Step 3.1.b:** Implement the MOEWD Workforce Development Plan to centralize workforce policy and streamline programming and evaluation with a renewed focus on employment needs and services in violence prone neighborhoods.

**Action Step 3.1.c:** Create on-ramps and points of entry for vulnerable individuals using a uniform ladder of opportunity across City-funded programs which include service learning, subsidized employment, unsubsidized employment, and high wage careers.

**Action Step 3.1.d:** Coordinate services across City-funded agencies to address pre-employment barriers for at-risk individuals (i.e. Clean Slate, Child Support Enforcement, counseling, and drug treatment).

**Action Step 3.1.e:** Connect at-risk individuals to emerging employment opportunities (e.g., green jobs).

**Action Step 3.1.f:** Make formal linkages with SFUSD, labor unions, local colleges, and CBOs with the City’s Workforce
Development Plan to strengthen and expand training, placement, professional development, and advancement opportunities for residents.

Action Step 3.1.g: Support the purchase and launch of a data tracking system for workforce services.

Objective 3.2 Provide Safe and Affordable Housing for At-risk Communities.
San Francisco is home to the 13th largest system of public housing in the country. Nationally, there is a strong correlation between public housing and violence. In San Francisco, violence is concentrated in and around public housing sites and the neighborhoods with the highest density of public housing are also the neighborhoods disproportionately impacted by violence. Factors that increase the likelihood of violence in public housing projects are highly concentrated poverty and joblessness, population density, social and spatial isolation, dilapidated and blighted conditions, lack of economic development. The poor quality of the housing and the depressed economies in neighborhoods around public housing sites contribute to the growth of illegal and violent activities.

Strategies that have proved effective in lowering rates of violence in housing projects have included concentrated economic development, improved housing conditions, comprehensive on-site services in the housing projects, on-site child and youth development programs, after-school and Saturday educational enrichment programs.

San Francisco is currently implementing an ambitious plan, HOPE SF, to redevelop public housing to add mixed income housing and retail, and thus, revitalize the communities around existing public housing sites which are largely economically depressed. Simultaneously, existing public housing conditions must be addressed to promote the health and well-being of at-risk communities with individuals who are living in squalid conditions.

Action Step 3.2.a: Establish baseline for measuring outcomes and set targets for outcome indicators.

Action Step 3.2.b: Support the SFHA and City Partnership for Safe and Decent Public Housing and the implementation of HOPE SF (underway by SFHA and MOH).

Action Step 3.2.c: Establish MOUs for coordinated multi-city agency approach for making and tracking physical safety improvements at SFHA sites such as speed bumps, bars on windows, gates, and removal of illegally parked car (underway by SFHA).
Action Step 3.2.d: Review SFHA existing work order and discharge requests processes and make refinements as necessary to ensure that repairs occur in a timely manner.

Action Step 3.2.e: Launch an awareness campaign to educate public housing residents on how to report repairs or security concerns, access financial assistance for repairs, and get involved in their resident associations.

Action Step 3.2.f: Devise strategies to strengthen and expand victim/witness protection services and pursue local and regional solutions to witness protection/relocation challenges.

Action Step 3.2.g: Expand access to effective services by analyzing existing city-funded programs serving public housing residents and developing clear MOUs with SFHA and other City agencies that can provide ongoing services to public housing residents.

Action Step 3.2.h: Enhance opportunities for community engagement among public housing residents by providing support to strengthen resident associations.

Action Step 3.2.i: Building on existing efforts, enhance police presence in public housing by developing enhanced strategies for police participation, such as continued augmentation of number of dedicated officers, enhanced training on community engagement with public housing residents, and enhanced relationship-building strategies for community service providers and police officers on public housing sites.

Action Step 3.2.j: Create a centralized reporting process within SFPD to track and notify SFHA of violent incidents at their sites.

Objective 3.3 Provide Quality and Effective Education to At-risk Communities. Negative school-related experiences such as poor academic performance, truancy, and dropping out of school are predictors of later criminal and violent behavior. Almost 94 percent of San Francisco homicide victims under the age of 25, within the past four years, were high school dropouts. Improving the quality of education, increasing alternative educational opportunities, and devising effective strategies to address truancy and connectedness are critical to mitigating and preventing violence.

Renewed attention is being placed on reducing truancy and increasing school connectedness because of the growing number of juveniles involved in crime and violence. A number of innovative initiatives are taking shape in San Francisco to collectively address this issue. Success of these initiatives will depend on how effective the partnerships between the City and its education partners are in tackling the education challenges.
Objective 3.4 Ensure Successful Re-entry for Individuals Exiting the Criminal Justice and Juvenile Justice Systems.

Nationally, past criminal justice involvement is identified as a major contributor to violence. California’s rate of incarceration and expenditure on prisons make it one of the highest in the U.S. for both adults and youth. Men and women are socialized within a violent subculture in prison and this often spreads to communities upon their release. Residents are returning to their homes following incarceration without adequate support services, job training, or economic opportunities. Ensuring that adults and youth who have been detained can successfully return to the community is a vital element of preventing violence. Achieving this requires focusing both on meeting the needs of people while they are detained and transitioning them successfully back into the community.

San Francisco has an impressive cadre of reentry programs. These programs could be improved with greater coordination between the two multi-agency bodies that plan and implement reentry services in San Francisco. Additionally, greater attention needs to be placed on identifying and applying effective and best practices, strengthening supervision for probationers, and creating stronger partnerships with community based organizations to deliver high quality services to ex-offenders.

Action Step 3.4.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.

Action Step 3.4.b: Develop a common definition of recidivism and a system to track recidivism.
Action Step 3.4.c: Establish reentry/release principles and practices (i.e., release dates, referrals, arrangements about the types of information probationers/parolees should be provided during release) and identify local and national model programs and best practices in reentry.

Action Step 3.4.d: Create a model programs/best practices re-entry matrix based on reentry/release principles to provide referrals and inform grant making/RFP process.

Action Step 3.4.e: Consolidate the San Francisco Reentry Council and Safe Communities Reentry Coordinating Council into the San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council, to streamline reentry policy and planning (underway by SCRC and SFRC).

Action Step 3.4.f: Through the City's Reentry Coordinating Council, implement a Strategic Plan for Reentry, and enhance coordination and working partnerships across agencies providing reentry services to increase use of services by reentering individuals (completed).

Action Step 3.4.g: Enhance reentry-focused job placement and housing placement programs by conducting a gaps analysis; either expand effective programs or develop model programs where appropriate.

Action Step 3.4.h: Reduce probation caseloads and build the capacity of probation officers through enhanced resources and training opportunities.

Action Step 3.4.i: Develop a uniform mechanism and coordinated case management system to assess needs and risks of reentering individuals, develop management plans, connect offenders with services pre-release, and track progress and outcomes post-release (underway by APD and JPD).

Action Step 3.4.j: Strengthen programs and incorporate models that assist ex-offenders to seal their criminal records such as the Public Defender’s “Clean Slate” program.

Objective 3.5 Strengthen Youth Development and Empowerment Opportunities.

San Francisco recognizes that young people need skills and support systems that will enable them to negotiate potentially volatile situations, forge strong attachments and relationships, participate in their schools and communities in meaningful ways, and have a sense of hope about their future.

Studies show that teens who are civically engaged are much more likely to be similarly engaged as adults. In addition, these same youth are more likely to succeed in school, avoid teen pregnancy and illicit drug use, and, be more hopeful about their future. Youth development and youth-driven programs that are focused on community development and improvement provide a vital arena for young people to connect with their community while having positive impacts.

Action Step 3.5.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.

Action Step 3.5.b: Develop a comprehensive assessment of the City’s youth development programs across City agencies and a uniform mechanism to evaluate and enhance such programming.
Action Step 3.5.c: Integrate uniform performance measures into grant guidelines for youth development and empowerment programming (underway by DCYF).

Action Step 3.5.d: Expand community capacity to provide effective youth development and empowerment programming in at-risk communities through multi-agency investment and uniform, strengthened training and consistent monitoring strategies (underway by DCYF).

Action Step 3.5.e: Assess and strengthen opportunities to increase intergenerational engagement, faith-based community involvement, cultural competency, and gender specific services.

Action Step 3.5.f: Expand peer outreach, recruitment, and enrollment.

Action Step 3.6.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.

Action Step 3.6.b: Strengthen City agency coordination to clean up blight and make environmental improvements in high violence area (i.e., lighting and greening projects).

Action Step 3.6.c: Strengthen neighborhood and resident associations in high violence areas.

Action Step 3.6.d: Strengthen community outreach and public education strategies to promote community involvement and neighborhood empowerment efforts. Encourage key stakeholders that do not typically participate in such efforts to become actively engaged (underway by MOCJ, DCYF, and MOCI).

Objective 3.6 Transform Community Conditions and Empower Residents.
In San Francisco, violence is highly concentrated in certain neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are largely African American and Latino and the violence there has reached crisis levels. Neighborhood-based strategies have proven effective around the country. Building on promising place-based strategies already in place, developing new strategies as necessary, and ensuring coordinated alignment of resources is critical to reducing violence in these communities.

Neighborhood-based strategies require a concentrated focus within target areas to ensure an appropriate level of services, a synergy between efforts, and reaching a point at which violence levels will fall. Increasing resident and community advocacy for community change, actively improving their efforts to keep and maintain safe and clean neighborhoods, and altering community norms around violence are paramount to reducing violence in these neighborhoods.
Action Step 3.6.e: Develop a comprehensive assessment of the City’s neighborhood beautification and community engagement programs across agencies and a uniform mechanism to evaluate and enhance this programming.

**Objective 3.7  Strengthen Family Support and Senior Support.**

Families are a cornerstone in the community. The home is where values, beliefs, and norms are learned and passed on. Families should be safe and nurturing places, yet family members often need appropriate skills and support in order to achieve this. Raising children is hard work and parents often need help and opportunities for skill building.

To strengthen family support, parenting skills and child development, classes should be integrated into pre- and post-natal healthcare and other settings for parents. Integrating culturally appropriate and effective skill development into settings with parents and ensuring widespread access will foster parenting skills and enable parents to form nurturing relationships, set appropriate boundaries, and foster social-emotional development.

Skill development will be enhanced through family support. When caregivers are supported, empowered, and successful in other areas of life, they make better parents and are more able to raise healthy children free from abuse and neglect. The goal of all family support programs is to increase the ability of parents to nurture their children and to ensure their optimal healthy physical, emotional, and cognitive development.

As family members become seniors, they require a great deal of support. This support is often provided by other members of the family. These caregivers do not always receive the training to provide the care that their elderly family member may need, and this can often lead to larger issues with safety and wellbeing. In other instances, seniors live and care for themselves with little outside help. This can sometimes lead to self-neglect and self-harm. Many cultural and socioeconomic factors put seniors at risk of isolation, exploitation, and/or abuse. In San Francisco, there has been a surge in allegations of elder abuse and there are reports that this type of abuse is increasingly gruesome.

The depiction of seniors as frail, weak, and dependent, coupled with strained familial relationships resulting from stress and frustration as an individual becomes more dependent, caregivers’ dependence for accommodation or financial support, social isolation due to physical or mental health issues, and the loss of family and friends are just some of the risk factors that contribute to elder abuse. The consequences of abuse can be especially harmful, and thus more should be done to improve support for seniors.

Action Step 3.7.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.
Action Step 3.7.b: Ensure that families, especially those in greatest need, have access to high quality family support programs and services especially those in greatest need.

Action Step 3.7.c: Support the development and launch of Parent University (underway by DCYF).

Action Step 3.7.d: Strengthen in-home support services for seniors and training for family caregivers.

Action Step 3.7.e: Support the implementation of the Family Support Standards across the City's family support programs, including the development and implementation of uniform assessment, evaluation, outcome tracking, and data reporting tools.

Action Step 3.7.f: Support training and ongoing assistance to provide high-quality family support services to vulnerable families.

Action Step 3.7.g: Identify gaps in current family support service delivery systems and develop a funding strategy to enhance existing as well as develop additional geographically based and citywide services for families.

Action Step 3.7.h: Strengthen the capacity of City-funded programs to embrace and implement family-centered service delivery by providing training and ongoing technical assistance.

Objective 3.8 Reduce the Impact of Trauma.

People who regularly witness violence often mimic those behaviors and have difficulty controlling their aggressive impulses and mediating conflicts. They also tend to exhibit behavior problems such as aggression, poor impulse control and problem-solving skills; lower levels of empathy, social competence and self-esteem; depression; inability to concentrate; and low academic performance. Chronic exposure to violence such as living in a violent home or neighborhood often results in accumulating negative effects that persist over the long term.

For example, boys who witness violence against their mothers during childhood have an increased likelihood of using violence against their domestic partners when they are adults. Witnessing and/or experiencing violence is traumatic. It can leave one feeling scared and helpless. San Francisco residents, particularly children, who are exposed to community violence, are deeply affected by symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Witnessing violence can contribute to normalizing violence as an acceptable behavior and increase risk for becoming a perpetrator or victim later in life. The trauma induced by witnessing and/or experiencing violence can lay the foundation for future mental health, substance abuse, and criminal justice problems. It is critical, therefore, that mental health and case management services be provided in a timely manner to allow people to deal with the trauma and to be able to heal. Such services can include support with handling rage and dealing with shame and stigma. These services must be culturally competent and family centered to be most effective.

Action Step 3.8.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.
Action Step 3.8.b: Enhance multi-agency coordination of existing trauma reduction programs (i.e. CRT, CRN, victims services, Teen Trauma Recovery Center, Trauma Recovery Center, Wrap Around Project, and SFUSD Wellness Centers (underway by DPH and DCYF).

Action Step 3.8.c: Develop a strategy to adjust overall deployment of mental health programs to be more geographically and home based.

Action Step 3.8.d: Strengthen protocols for identifying children exposed to violence and children with PTSD and enhance steps to connect them to services.

Action Step 3.8.e: Strengthen training for service providers, police, and teachers to respond to trauma related behavior.


Action Step 3.8.g: Promote the importance of self-care and adequate staff development to address the vicarious trauma experienced by service providers working with individuals in crisis (underway by DPH).

Action Step 3.8.h: Increase awareness of resources and services for victims of violence by developing a comprehensive resource guide each year.

Action Step 3.8.i: Support efforts to strengthen and expand SF Safe Start program.

Objective 3.9 Strengthen Community Policing.

In many of San Francisco’s violence prone neighborhoods there is severe mistrust between the police and the residents. Community policing is a strategy and philosophy built on the premise that community interaction and support can help control crime, with community members helping to identify suspects and bringing problems to the attention of police.

San Francisco has implemented a variety of community policing strategies and conducted ongoing dialogue to develop a uniform vision for the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) about how community policing should be institutionalized in the department or carried out in the community. In order to reap the benefits of community policing, the philosophy must be integrated into the culture and training of the police department and the community must be included in the planning and implementation.

Action Step 3.9.a: Implement the consensus recommendations of the Community Policing Advisory Committee.

Action Step 3.9.b: Utilize the Community Police Advisory Committee as a civilian oversight body that is charged with monitoring implementation of community policing.

Action Step 3.9.c: Build on the SFPD assessment of what it will take to fully implement a comprehensive community policing model that impacts all bureaus within the Department from the Academy to the beat officers to Gang Task Force to the Command Staff and implement the action plan.

Action Step 3.9.d: Expand community policing training for officers and community members through a collaborative effort between the Police Academy, SFUSD and community-based organizations.
Action Step 3.9.e: Develop a community policing strategy specific to San Francisco Housing Authority properties.

Action Step 3.9.f: Increase language capacity throughout SFPD by ensuring District Stations and tip-lines, both anonymous and non-anonymous, are multi-lingual.

Objective 3.10 Reduce Harmful Impact of Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs.

Nationwide, alcohol is the drug most closely associated with violent incidents; some researchers estimate that it is implicated in 50 to 66 percent of all homicides, 20 to 36 percent of suicides and more than half of all cases of domestic violence. The scientific literature strongly suggests that the use of alcohol and drugs results in higher levels of aggression and crime, and neighborhoods with higher concentrations of liquor stores often experience more violence. Low socioeconomic status and predominately black census tracts have significantly more liquor stores per capita than communities that are more affluent and/or predominately white. Reducing the density of alcohol outlets has been shown to reduce crime and violence in the immediate area. The impact that is perhaps most salient to residents in the short-term is a feeling that the neighborhood is a safer and more pleasant place to be.

Violence that is related to alcohol and/or drugs can be more damaging and often lethal because of the vast availability and frequent usage of guns in violence-prone communities. Therefore, it is critical to limit the availability of firearms and minimize the usage of firearms. This requires a combination of policy advocacy, strong law enforcement and public education campaigns to shift social norms.

Action Step 3.10.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.

Action Step 3.10.b: Expand parent accountability for youth/children carrying firearms and build a component of required parental involvement into Family Court.

Action Step 3.10.c: Launch a public education campaign to send a strong message against gun violence and illegal gun activity that emphasizes responsible gun ownership, education and awareness about gun safety, existing laws, and the danger of replicas (underway by MOCJ).

Action Step 3.10.d: Partner with local, state, and national elected officials to develop and advocate for legislation to reform hand gun laws (underway by Mayor).
Action Step 3.10.e: Strengthen efforts to stop straw purchasing (purchase of illegal firearms) and gun trafficking (underway by SFPD).

Action Step 3.10.f: Strengthen law enforcement collaboration to remove guns from the street and respond uniformly to gun violence (underway by SFPD).

Action Step 3.10.g: Strengthen coordination across City and regional agencies responsible for code enforcement, drug and alcohol prevention and education strategies, and substance abuse.

Action Step 3.10.h: Strengthen education for children on negative impact of drug and alcohol addiction.

Action Step 3.10.i: Develop a neighborhood-based public education campaign about drugs and alcohol.

Action Step 3.10.j: Strengthen merchants’ involvement in alcohol and drug abuse prevention.

Action Step 3.10.k: Create a comprehensive assessment of existing drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs, identify training and capacity building needs, and develop a system for ongoing monitoring and evaluation.
San Francisco has led numerous planning processes to address violence prevention, but implementation has been inconsistent, resulting in little change. The success of this Plan lies in our ability to implement it by working collaboratively to strategically invest resources and maximize impact. In many respects, the most critical component of a planning process of this nature is to design a successful approach for implementation. When exploring how to structure the implementation of this Plan, careful attention was paid to the lessons learned from attempts to implement those previous violence prevention plans.

To strengthen the likelihood of successful implementation, strengths and weaknesses of previous violence prevention efforts were analyzed. Stakeholder interviews, published data, and other literature revealed that some of the challenges to realizing sustained violence prevention efforts overtime include difficulty maintaining multi-agency buy-in, the absence of sustained political support and ever changing political priorities, staff turnover in key positions, and insufficient attention to the details of immediate, short-term implementation strategies.

The lessons learned from these previous efforts highlight the importance of 1) action-oriented next steps for implementation coupled with longer term strategies, 2) an interagency governance
Initial implementation focuses on manageable violence prevention efforts targeted at two of the most at-risk populations – probationers and parolees, and youth involved in the juvenile justice system, foster care system, and/or mental health system using a family centered approach.

The scope and scale of such a comprehensive strategy can be overwhelming to the individuals charged with carrying it out. Therefore, initial implementation focuses on manageable violence prevention efforts targeted at two of the most at-risk populations – probationers and parolees, and youth involved in the juvenile justice system, foster care system, and/or mental health system using a family centered approach.

Drawing upon two existing city-wide efforts to reduce violence among high risk youth, the Plan provides a larger framework for this work, and gives the contextual direction that will most likely lead to sustainable, lasting effects. The Plan calls for simultaneous action – providing the immediate response that the current level of violence in San Francisco deserves, with the focus and commitment to long term strategies and coordination it requires. By reinforcing existing efforts city-wide, calling for the appointment of a Violence Prevention Director to facilitate the process, and laying out a framework for effective department collaboration, a comprehensive violence prevention plan can lead to sustainable, lasting effects.

Violence prevention efforts will be ramped up immediately in four critical policy areas: Education, Employment, Housing, and Safety and focus on solidifying a handful of key initiatives. These initiatives may include The Center for Academic Reentry and Empowerment (CARE) to address truancy, employment ladders to create a continuum of employment opportunities that address everything from pre-employment barriers to permanent job placement, witness/victim services with a focus on improving transfers within public housing, and Reentry planning with a focus on fully constituting the Reentry Coordinating Council.

Often, responses to waves of violence may lead to short sighted, “band-aid fix” action, or the complexity of the issue may lead to planning that is open-ended without clear action steps, delegation, or a clear timeline for implementation. The Plan is unique as it addresses both the immediate need for action and the required framework for sustainable, long-term violence prevention efforts.

**GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE**

The Interagency Council (IAC) will oversee the Mayor’s five signature initiatives, and to prevent duplication of efforts, collaborate to decrease burden on city departments, streamline bureaucracy, and create a new system for sharing information and ensuring accountability. The IAC will be managed and staffed by the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD), to facilitate interagency collaboration and cooperation to better serve the City’s vulnerable populations. The IAC will aid in leveraging resources to support the mayor’s five signature initiatives (COO, HOPE SF, CityBuild/RAMP/Workforce Development, Transitional Age, and the San Francisco
Violence Prevention Plan), and will ensure integrated planning of strategies, coordinated service delivery and case management, shared accountability for outcomes, and aligned and effective use of City resources. The IAC will work closely with the Violence Prevention Director, a newly appointed position by the Mayor, to reduce policy, budgetary, and other potential roadblocks to implementation of the recommendations outlined in the Plan, and will monitor progress for both City and community implementation and status of meeting initiative-specific goals.

The IAC will include, but not be limited to, the directors of the Mayor’s five signature initiatives and Officers or their designees of the Department of Human Services, Public Health, Children, Youth & Their Families, Housing, Office of Criminal Justice, and the Housing Authority. The IAC will be co-facilitated by the Director of the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD) and the Deputy Chief of Staff of Health and Human Services of the Mayor’s Office. Experts and funders may be added to the IAC at a later time as appropriate.

The Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) will have membership from both City agencies and the community and will 1) integrate the community voice into policy and planning, 2) conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the plan to monitor progress and hold City agencies accountable, and 3) recommend adjustments in the 5-Year workplan. The VPAC will coordinate closely with other advisory committees to monitor trends and develop relevant violence prevention policies and integrated strategies ranging from primary prevention to intervention, response and law enforcement.

The VPAC will carry out the work of the Summer Street Violence Prevention Council and include directors or their designees of law enforcement agencies (SFPD, Sheriff, Criminal Justice, Adult Probation, Juvenile Probation, and ex officio members of the Public Defender and District Attorney offices), and the Department of Public Health, Human Services Agency, Children, Youth & Families, Status of Women, Workforce, Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD); the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District; and the director of the San Francisco Housing Authority. The Deputy Chief of Staffs for Criminal Justice and Health & Human Services will work closely with the Violence Prevention Director to ensure coordinated, successful planning, and, implementation, and accomplishment of violence prevention outcomes.

**Violence Prevention Director** will manage all aspects of policy development, planning, coordination, administrative and implementation functions of the Violence Prevention Plan; serve as the primary point of contact for the initiative; and work in close partnership with the directors of Communities of Opportunity and the Transitional Aged Youth Task Force.
Additional focus areas for the VPAC and IAC could include interagency coordination to 1) build CBO capacity to deliver higher quality services and demonstrate effectiveness, 2) link existing outreach and community engagement efforts, 3) drive the City’s data and evaluation projects to oversee implementation and work to optimize the utilization of these systems, 4) streamline grants solicitation and grant making, align and leverage public and private investments, and maximize the efficacy of those resources. Many of these efforts are already underway.

**CBO Capacity Building & Engagement Coordination** will link all relevant capacity building and CBO engagement initiatives and activities, guide departments on how best to coordinate CBO related services, and engage CBO’s on a regular basis for training and information opportunities. San Francisco has hundreds of CBOs engaged in critical work, yet many of these agencies struggle to deliver high quality services because they lack a sufficient infrastructure. Numerous City agencies provide training and technical assistance to build the capacity of CBO’s. This work is significant, however efforts could be more effective if they were better coordinated and designed to meet CBO needs within a common interagency understanding of what those needs are.

**Community Engagement Coordination** will link all community engagement initiatives and activities and guide departments on how best to coordinate their outreach and community engagement activities. The City recognizes the importance of community engagement in building vibrant, healthy, thriving, communities, which is evidenced by its considerable investment of resources to achieve stakeholder engagement. Examples of this include the Community Response Network (CRN), Safety Network, Community Builders, Community Conveners and the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services. These efforts could be strengthened with greater coordination, reducing duplication of effort and maximizing the City’s current investment to meet the community needs.

**Data & Evaluation Coordination** will advance the implementation of the City’s innovative data projects and ensure that the common indicators adopted by the IAC are adequately captured in those data systems. San Francisco’s data and technology systems require ongoing attention to fully utilize their capabilities. There are a number of innovative data projects underway in the City to bring San Francisco in line with national standards for data collection and evaluation. These projects have been consistently under-resourced and understaffed. Consequently, the City lacks the data necessary to evaluate effectiveness, demonstrate a return on investment for the programs it funds, and is unable to effectively manage its investment. Greater coordination could result in implementation of systems, improve data quality, and facilitate inter-agency data sharing.

**Grants Management Coordination** under the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD), will help align the CBO grant making process for City departments to ensure an optimal use of resources and institute procedures to centralize the process of grants solicitation of local and state funding. Grants management in San Francisco is grossly fragmented, and it is not infrequent for a single CBO to receive funding from multiple City agencies without those agencies ever communicating with one another. Moreover, in the absence of streamlined procedures for grants solicitation, City agencies often compete with one another for state and local funding. Coordinating these efforts will help streamline the grant making process, enhance efficiencies, and alleviate burden on community service providers engaged in violence prevention work.
PROPOSED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Interagency Council (IAC)

Housing & Homelessness
Community & Economic Development
Education, Family Support & Youth Development
Public Safety

Violence Prevention Advisory Committee → Director, Violence Prevention
TAY Task Force → Director, Transitional Aged Youth
COO Action Teams, NBO Council → Director, Communities of Opportunity
Advisory Committee → Director, HOPE SF
Workforce Investment Board → Director, Workforce

Grants Management Coordination
CBO Engagement Coordination
Outreach Coordination
Data & Evaluation Coordination

PROPOSED YEAR 1 INITIATIVES

HOUSING & HOMELESSNESS

- Eviction Prevention
- Employment ladders
- Parent University
- Coordinated reentry services

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- TAY Housing
- One-stops/Citybuild
- Truancy/academic recovery
- Alive & Free

EDUCATION, FAMILY SUPPORT & YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

- Victim/witness relocation
- Multi-service centers
- SF CAN DO
- Call-Ins

PUBLIC SAFETY

PHASED IMPLEMENTATION: SHORT TERM: YEAR 1

To achieve the goals of the Violence Prevention Plan, the Transitional Aged Youth Task Force and Communities of Opportunity, the following initiatives are proposed as the initial focus of the Interagency Council during the first year of implementation. Final decisions about year-one initiatives will be determined by the Interagency Council.

IMMEDIATE TRIAGE STRATEGY: INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PLAN

The ‘Call-In’ Strategy for Probationers and Parolees
Building on the multi-agency approach, led by MOCJ, to “call in” the most at-risk probationers, case management services and community supervision for this population will be enhanced by developing stronger ties between probation officers and community-based managers to supervise probationers.
Preliminary results of the Call-In Strategy are promising. Initiated in the Western Addition in June 2007, only one homicide occurred since the Call-In began, compared to 15 homicides the previous year. This is an opportune time to fully implement this approach. Juvenile and Adult Probation, Mental Health Services, and Child Welfare have all begun utilizing a geographic caseload assignment model, and caseloads will now be assigned by neighborhoods, thus improving continuity and service delivery. As these agencies move to this model, the City can begin implementing a coordinated case management team model as outlined within this Plan. Coordinated case management teams should be co-located so they can work closely with one another, share information, and eliminate the cost of operating multiple locations.

**SF CAN DO**

San Francisco Families, Community Agencies, and Neighborhoods Deciding as One (SF CAN DO) utilizes a similar model of family-centered coordinated case management (described above) for youth involved in the juvenile justice system, child welfare system, and/or mental health system. The difference is in the way clients become known to the case management teams. Participants of the ‘Call-Ins’ become known by probation and police. SF CAN DO targets youth who are known because of their involvement in child welfare systems.

There will invariably be overlap between the families served by these strategies. Moreover, because the goal of the coordinated case management team is to develop a single case plan for a family, the coordinated case management teams will likely be the same over time as the approach is implemented.

These strategies apply national best practices from New York and Boston. However, the hybrid model is unique to San Francisco. Thus, if implemented correctly, San Francisco has an opportunity to establish itself as an innovator of national best practices in violence prevention. The City has the necessary ingredients for success - the issue is not what to do, but finding the will to do it.

**LONGER-TERM: 5-YEAR WORK PLAN**

In addition to the triage strategy outlined above, there are short, intermediate, and long term action steps that must be executed to establish the foundation for sustainable violence prevention.

The proposed 5-Year work plan is outlined in the next section.
To allow the Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) and Interagency Council (IAC) to track progress toward implementing the action steps contained herein and achieving the Plan’s goals and objectives, a work plan has been developed. This 5-Year work plan outlines the goals, objectives, rationale, and action steps to support this aggressive violence prevention strategy. It also captures the timeline for completing each action step, the lead agency responsible for making sure the action step is completed and the cooperating agencies who are critical to completing the action step.

The 5-Year work plan outlined in this section is a blueprint for laying the foundation for immediate and sustainable violence prevention efforts in San Francisco. The details of the work plan including outcome benchmarks, timeline, and roles will need to be finalized by the VPAC and IAC. The work plan will serve as a guide for implementation and tool for evaluation over the next five years with the shared goal of reducing and preventing violence in San Francisco.

The proposed 5-Year work plan outlines the goals, objectives, rationale, and action steps to support this aggressive violence prevention strategy...and is the blueprint for laying the foundation to achieve immediate and sustainable results.
**GOAL 1:**
Coordinate to harmonize the work of City agencies so that local government is more capable of achieving violence prevention.

**OBJECTIVE 1.1: PRIORITIZE VIOLENCE PREVENTION AS A HEALTH CRISIS**

Strategy Rationale: Bold political leadership and placing violence prevention at the top of the political agenda are key requisites for successful violence prevention according to national best practices. An executive directive will send city agencies a mandate that prioritizes violence prevention and legislation will codify the work and proposed implementation structure into law so that this comprehensive strategy will transcend political whim and remains in place regardless of leadership transitions.

**Performance Indicators:**
- Interagency Council meeting regularly.
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee created.
- Legislation introduced and adopted to codify Plan.
- Political directive made to mandate coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1a: Issue an executive directive that declares violence a health crisis that must be addressed through concentrated and strategic interagency efforts, community investments, and widespread public education.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1b: Enact legislation to establish and codify a Violence Prevention Advisory Committee with the authority and mandate to streamline the City’s violence prevention efforts, share information, identify shared measurable outcomes, and hold each agency accountable for measuring and achieving these outcomes.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Mayor • Board of Sups</td>
<td>• City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1c: Appoint a Director of Violence Prevention to lead all aspects of violence prevention policy development, planning, coordination and implementation of San Francisco violence prevention efforts using the Plan as a blueprint.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1d: Convene the Interagency Council and Violence Prevention Advisory Committee to facilitate citywide coordination and oversee implementation of the Violence Prevention Plan.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1e: Partner with state and federal officials to craft and support anti-violence legislation, advocate for the support of violence prevention efforts, and garner new resources.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council (IAC) • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee (VPAC) • Mayor’s Government or Affairs Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 1.2: Establish Mandated Coordination and Collaboration Across City Agencies and With the Community**

Strategy Rationale: City departments currently invested in violence prevention and reduction efforts must collaborate in a strategic way. A coordinated leadership structure will provide an opportunity for the City to address the problem of violence with focused and strategic direction. Department heads will be required to collaborate to determine new ways to work together, leverage resources, share information, and implement programs and services to achieve measurable violence prevention outcomes.

**Performance Indicators:**
- Interagency Council convened and meeting regularly.
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee convened and meeting regularly.
- Definitions adopted for core concepts.
- Annual inventory updated.
- Evidence of joint planning for programs in core policy areas (particularly between law enforcement and social services).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.a: Develop and adopt uniform definitions for prevention, intervention, and response.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.b: Develop and update an inventory of violence prevention programs and services for all City agencies and departments on a regular basis to serve as a resource guide and tool for coordinated planning.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.c: Require City agencies to include violence prevention strategies in their strategic plans.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.d: Identify and replicate best practices and fill gaps in services.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.e: Conduct an annual performance review to monitor implementation, document progress, and make improvements in the Violence Prevention Plan.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 1.3: Develop Shared Outcomes to Measure Accountability**

Strategy Rationale: Despite best efforts of City agencies and community service providers, violence continues to rise. City agencies must develop common outcomes and indicators of success to better direct efforts to achieve measurable reductions in violence, to evaluate program effectiveness, to ensure violence prevention money is being used efficiently and responsibly and to hold City and community agencies accountable.

**Performance Indicators:**
- Baseline performance and accountability metrics established.
- City-funded programs reviewed annually to ensure standards are being met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.a: Establish and adopt baseline uniform performance outcomes.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.b: Establish and adopt minimum quality standards for the City’s violence prevention, intervention, and response programs.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.c: Ensure shared outcomes are tracked by all relevant data collection systems.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>Interagency Council</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 1.4: ALIGN RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACHIEVING SHARED OUTCOMES**

**Strategy Rationale:** There is significant duplication in funding through a dozen city agencies without sufficient justification or adherence to a common set of outcomes. City departments need to better align existing resources, leverage funding where possible, procure new resources as necessary and develop effective mechanisms to track services and associated costs to ensure that dollars are being spent effectively and have the intended effect on achieving tangible violence prevention results. Align and leverage and direct appropriate funds to explicit violence reduction and prevention strategies.

**Performance Indicators:**
- Budget reflects appropriation of more resources to prevention.
- Demonstrated leveraging of resources to support violence prevention in all City departments.
- Evidence of joint, interdepartmental applications for new funding to support collaborative violence prevention efforts.
- Evidence of data-driven, joint decision-making for funding support of key community initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4.a: Inventory current violence prevention funding by agency. Map/matrix violence prevention resources geographically, by target population, by department, and by funding source. | Year 1-5  | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • City Controller |
| 1.4.b: Review budget to monitor appropriations for violence prevention, intervention, and response, and guide budget development for the City. | Year 1-5  | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.c: Identify and assess available funding sources to support violence prevention including, but not limited to: CalWorks, PAES, CDBG, Children's Fund, Prop 36, First Five, Law Enforcement Resources, Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Prop 63, and HOME funds. | Year 1     | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.d: Establish protocol to require all City agencies and department to demonstrate leveraging of violence prevention resources. Create a master calendar of the City’s RFP/grant making processes. | Year 1     | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.e: Establish protocols to require all City agencies and departments to collaborate on new grant solicitations. | Year 1     | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.f: Centralize the solicitation and procurement of new resources. | Year 2     | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.g: Establish protocol that requires City departments to collaborate in developing annual budgets based on data generated from new performance standards. | Year 2     | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
| 1.4.h: Integrate shared outcomes and minimum standards into City grant-making processes. | Year 1-5   | • Interagency Council/MOCI  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Budget Office  
• City Controller |
**OBJECTIVE 1.5 EVALUATE THROUGH SHARED DATA AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

Strategy Rationale: To effectively measure success, data must be collected and analyzed in a uniform and consistent manner for all City programs and services as well as trends and patterns of violence. Information technologies must be improved to facilitate data collection, and existing efforts to enhance tracking and sharing of data must be adopted. Investing in evaluation will help improve program design and ensure that future programmatic and funding decisions are driven by results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Confidentiality and consent issues addressed to enable data sharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progression in the creation of shared data systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation protocol developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.a: Evaluate through Shared Data and Information Systems.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>• Controllers Office</td>
<td>• Interagency Council</td>
<td>• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.b: Complete the development and implementation of the JUSTIS technology project.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• JUSTIS Governance Council</td>
<td>• MOCJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.c: Develop shared data agreements and confidentiality protocols. Consider the Shared Youth Database as a model.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• City Attorney</td>
<td>• Interagency Council</td>
<td>• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.d: Provide training to city staff and CBO staff on data collection, reporting, and evaluation.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interagency Council</td>
<td>• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.e: Adequately staff and resource JUSTIS (San Francisco’s National Violent Death Review System) and the Shared Youth Database.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>• Controllers Office</td>
<td>• DPH, MOCJ, HSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.f: Create evaluation protocols for City grantees and prioritize needs.</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interagency Council</td>
<td>• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.g: Partner with an independent entity to complete an annual evaluation of City funded programs and help shape guidelines and expectations around future funding opportunities.</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interagency Council</td>
<td>• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1.5: Evaluate Through Shared Data and Information Systems (Continued)

**Strategy Rationale:** To effectively measure success, data must be collected and analyzed in a uniform and consistent manner for all City programs and services as well as trends and patterns of violence. Information technologies must be improved to facilitate data collection, and existing efforts to enhance tracking and sharing of data must be adopted. Investing in evaluation will help improve program design and ensure that future programmatic and funding decisions are driven by results.

**Performance Indicators:**
- Confidentiality and consent issues addressed to enable data sharing.
- Progression in the creation of shared data systems.
- Evaluation protocol developed.

| 1.5.h: Use data generated from evaluation and performance reviews to inform budget development and other funding decisions. |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1-5 | Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |

| 1.5.i: Analyze and report out quarterly the progress toward benchmarks, the status of implementation, and fidelity to minimum standards. |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1-5 | Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |
GOAL 2:
Invest more strategically to increase the community's capacity to achieve violence prevention in partnership with the City.

OBJECTIVE 2.1: DEFINE AND ADOPT SHARED PRINCIPLES FOR COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Strategy Rationale: While the City funds a significant array of violence prevention programs and services, a coherent vision for how this works is needed to empower and transform at-risk communities. Creating this vision will provide a framework for City agencies to set priorities, guide investments, and focus evaluations. The new vision requires a paradigm shift that prioritizes coordination and partnerships, improves resident navigation of services, uses real-time information and data to address emerging issues, and strengthens the relationship between community and City efforts.

Performance Indicators: - Core concepts and principles for community transformation adopted and disseminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1.a: Convene joint meetings with the Interagency Council and the advisory bodies to define and adopt shared principles of community transformation. These discussions should begin with COO's existing vision. | Year 1    | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |
| 2.1.b: Disseminate the shared definition and principles with all city agencies and community-based organizations, and integrate definitions into training and grantmaking processes. | Year 1-5  | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |
| 2.1.c: Provide training to city and community staff about practices, policies, and philosophies that support these principles to enhance existing programs and integrate in the development of new programs. | Year 1-5  | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |
| Step 2.1.d: Establish protocol that requires adherence to transformation principles in all new request for proposals (RFPs) and funding decisions that impact vulnerable populations. | Year 1    | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee |
### Objective 2.2: Develop a Coordinated, Family-Centered, Neighborhood-Focused Service Delivery System

**Strategy Rationale:** The existing service delivery system in San Francisco tends to be disconnected. Providers are often not communicating and services may not be reaching the geographic areas most in need. Coordinated, targeted service delivery and case management for specific neighborhoods most affected by violence will have a more significant impact. Serving entire families and not just individuals will provide a more comprehensive, holistic, and seamless system of care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Inventory of existing services is developed and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Geographic hotspots are identified and prioritized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Services are aligned with geographic needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programs share information to benefit extended family networks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2.a: Create a comprehensive list of services throughout the City that can serve as a resource guide for service providers and outreach workers. | Year 1 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | | |
| 2.2.b: Create maps of hot spot areas and issues these areas face to assess service needs and inform service delivery and coordinated case management. | Year 1-2 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | | |
| Step 2.2.c: Develop a coordinated service delivery model to reduce duplication of efforts, and coordinate information sharing that will be responsive to neighborhood needs and serve the whole family. | Year 1-2 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | | |
| 2.2.d: Develop MOUs and clear protocols for data sharing among city agencies and service providers to support the coordinated case management system with attention to privacy and confidentiality issues. | Year 1 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • City Attorney |
**OBJECTIVE 2.3: COORDINATE AND STRENGTHEN TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING FOR BOTH CITY AND COMMUNITY**

 Strategy Rationale: The City needs a comprehensive set of standards for ensuring the quality, strength, and professionalism of city-funded efforts. Renewed investments in building capacity for city staff and community agencies are necessary. Training in best practices, assisting in organizational development and institution-building, and developing evaluation protocols will help provide a stronger, more effective network of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment of existing capacity-building and training efforts completed and disseminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uniform, citywide training protocol developed, tested, and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uniform, citywide grant-making and reporting strategies developed, tested, and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.a: Centralize planning, coordination, and implementation of the City’s capacity building efforts to build community institutions that are able to operate at capacity and the highest skills level.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.b: Conduct a formal assessment of all existing capacity-building and training efforts, identify gaps, and develop plans to fill those gaps.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.c: Develop a uniform mechanism by which all city grantees are trained and supported in professional development and continued education for violence prevention.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.d: Make the City funding and reporting procedures uniform, clear, and user-friendly for all community-based organizations.</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.e: Require agencies to complete specific training to meet qualifications for city funding, including training on evaluation techniques. Consider using the COO Neighborhood Benefit Organization (NBO) Institute as a model.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.f: Jointly monitor grantee compliance with contract requirements, including minimum performance standards, program quality standards, and basic operational principles, such as insurance and fiscal compliance. Expand the Controller’s Joint Monitoring Project or use the MOCI compliance model.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 2.3: COORDINATE AND STRENGTHEN TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING FOR BOTH CITY AND COMMUNITY (CONTINUED)**

Strategy Rationale: The City needs a comprehensive set of standards for ensuring the quality, strength, and professionalism of city-funded efforts. Renewed investments in building capacity for city staff and community agencies are necessary. Training in best practices, assisting in organizational development and institution-building, and developing evaluation protocols will help provide a stronger, more effective network of services.

### Outcome Indicators:
- Assessment of existing capacity-building and training efforts completed and disseminated.
- Uniform, citywide training protocol developed, tested, and implemented.
- Uniform, citywide grant-making and reporting strategies developed, tested, and implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.g: Include grantees in planning around evaluation protocols and shared data efforts including training to effectively collect, input, analyze, and report data on participation and other variables.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.h: Link Anchor Institutions, Family Resource Centers and neighborhood multi-service center concepts, planning, and funding to avoid duplication. Support the launch of these efforts in affected communities once there is clarity about service delivery responsibilities.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 2.4:**

**STRENGTHEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN THE COORDINATED SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM AND TRAINING**

Strategy Rationale: Philanthropic and corporate investments in programs, services, and capacity building are a significant resource to the City and its residents. These private investments often occur independent of the City’s resource allocation. Developing a strong public/private partnership to support violence prevention and coordinated case management is integral to the success of this comprehensive approach. Developing a forum and regular meeting schedule will strengthen the public/private partnerships that already exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Establish a funders/corporate circle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Convene funders/corporate circle monthly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Garner new resources through the public/private partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.a: Convene a funder’s circle to identify policy, service, and program needs, funding and in-kind support opportunities.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Interagency Council/ MOCI • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Private Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.b: Integrate private investors into annual budgeting process to align public and private investments. Funding decisions should be data driven.</td>
<td>Year 2-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Private Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.c: Centralize the City’s grant solicitation, review, and procurement under the Mayor’s Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD).</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Private Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.d: Strengthen the involvement of key stakeholders such as the Chamber of Commerce and key trade associations. Connect successful models.</td>
<td>Year 1-5</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Chamber Trade Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.e: Coordinate City grantmaking and compliance processes so that they are uniform and strategic across City agencies and more efficient and effective for community agencies. Expand MOCI compliance model.</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• MOCI</td>
<td>• MOCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 2.5: STRENGTHEN COMMUNITY OUTREACH STRATEGIES AND CONNECTIVITY**

Strategy Rationale: Community outreach is an established best practice for violence prevention. While many strong outreach programs exist in San Francisco, better coordination, communication, and information sharing are necessary. In addition, the City needs to continue its efforts to engage residents in community building activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.a: Coordinate existing City-funded outreach efforts to 1) assign clear roles and responsibilities for the work and 2) establish clear protocols for making referrals to programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.b: Plan community outreach events in partnership with key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.c: Convene a regular coordinating meeting of representatives from existing outreach efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.5.a: Coordinate existing City-funded outreach efforts to 1) assign clear roles and responsibilities for the work and 2) establish clear protocols for making referrals to programs. | Year 1-5 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • CBOs |
| 2.5.b: Plan community outreach events in partnership with key agencies. | Year 1-5 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • CRN  
• MONS  
• Safety Network |
| 2.5.c: Convene a regular coordinating meeting of representatives from existing outreach efforts. | Year 1-5 | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • CBOs |
**GOAL 3:**

Hold City and community accountable for achieving concrete, short and longer term, measurable outcomes in 10-key policy areas.

**OBJECTIVE 3.1: CREATE CAREER PATHS FOR AT-RISK COMMUNITIES**

Strategy Rationale: There is a strong correlation between violence and poverty which is spurred by lack of permanent, livable wage employment for individuals and communities vulnerable to violence. Addressing the barriers that keep these individuals from economic self-sufficiency, providing training and job placements are a few of the most important strategies to prevent violence.

**Outcome Indicators:**

- Increase number of successful job placements.
- Increase employment rates for low-income residents.
- Increase average wage level.
- Increase number of high school youth with summer employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1.a: Establish a baseline measure for outcomes and set targets for outcome indicators. | | • Interagency Council
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • WIB
• Youth Council
• Reentry Coordinating Council |
| 3.1.b: Implement the MOEWD Workforce Development Plan to centralize workforce policy and streamline programming and evaluation with a renewed focus on employment needs and services in violence prone neighborhoods. | | • MOEWD | • HSA, DCYF,
• MYEEP, JPD,
• Parks and Rec,
• MOCD, Sheriff,
• DA, PUC, WIB,
• Chamber of Commerce,
• DPW |
| 3.1.c: Create on-ramps and points of entry for vulnerable individuals using a uniform ladder of opportunity across City-funded programs that include service learning, subsidized employment, unsubsidized employment, and high wage careers. | | • MOWED | • HSA, DCYF,
• PUC, JPD, Parks & Rec,
• MOCD, Sheriff |
| 3.1.d: Coordinate services across City-funded agencies to address pre-employment barriers for at-risk individuals (i.e., Clean Slate, Child Support Enforcement, counseling, and drug treatment). | | • MOEWD | • PD, City College,
• Child Support Enforcement,
• Dept of Motor Vehicles, DPH,
• HSA |
**Objective 3.1: Create Career Paths for At-Risk Communities (Continued)**

Strategy Rationale: There is a strong correlation between violence and poverty which is spurred by lack of permanent, livable wage employment for individuals and communities vulnerable to violence. Addressing the barriers that keep these individuals from economic self-sufficiency, providing training and job placements are a few of the most important strategies to prevent violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of successful job placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase employment rates for low-income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase average wage level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of high school youth with summer employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.e: Connect at-risk individuals to emerging employment opportunities (e.g., green jobs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.f: Make formal linkages with SFUSD, labor unions, local colleges, and CBOs with the City’s Workforce Development Plan to strengthen and expand training, placement, professional development, and advancement opportunities for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.g: Support the purchase and launch of a data tracking system for workforce services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MOWED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MOEWD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MOEWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SFUSD, Labor Unions, City College, CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interagency Council, Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 3.2: PROVIDE SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR AT-RISK COMMUNITIES**

Strategy Rationale: San Francisco is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis, resulting in few quality housing options for low and even middle income families. Rising housing costs and limited supply of affordable housing options coupled with the out-migration of middle class families has resulted in intense geographical concentration of poverty in and around public housing. There is a strong correlation between public housing and violence. Nationally, individuals who receive public housing assistance are twice as likely to be gun victims as people who do not live in public housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of public housing units in compliance with health and safety codes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of public housing sites with community safety measures in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase presence of police and/or security officers on public housing property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of public housing victims/witnesses successfully protected or relocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of affordable housing units available in San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.a: Establish baseline for measuring outcomes and set targets for outcome indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.b: Support the SFHA and City Partnership for Safe and Decent Public Housing and the implementation of HOPE SF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.c: Establish MOUs for coordinated multi-city agency approach for making and tracking physical safety improvements at SFHA sites such as speed bumps, bars on windows, gates, and removal of illegally parked cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.d: Review SFHA existing work order and discharge requests processes and make refinements as necessary to ensure that repairs occur in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.e: Launch an awareness campaign to educate public housing residents on how to report repairs or security concerns, access financial assistance for repairs, and get involved in their resident associations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.f: Devise strategies to strengthen and expand victim/witness protection services and pursue local and regional solutions to witness protection/relocation challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHART CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
**Objective 3.2: Provide Safe and Affordable Housing for At-Risk Communities (continued)**

**Strategy Rationale:** San Francisco is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis resulting in few quality housing options for low and even middle income families. Rising housing costs and limited supply of affordable housing options coupled with the out migration of middle class families has resulted in intense geographical concentration of poverty in and around public housing. There is a strong correlation between public housing and violence. Nationally, individuals who receive public housing assistance are twice as likely to be gun victims as people who do not live in public housing.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Increase number of public housing units in compliance with health and safety codes.
- Increase number of public housing sites with community safety measures in place.
- Increase presence of police and/or security officers on public housing property.
- Increase number of public housing victims/witnesses successfully protected or relocated.
- Increase number of affordable housing units available in San Francisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.g: Expand access to effective services by analyzing existing City-funded programs serving public housing residents and developing clear MOUs with SFHA and other City agencies that can provide ongoing services to public housing residents. Building on existing efforts, enhance police presence in public housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFHA</td>
<td>MOH, HSA, DPH, DCYF, SFUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.h: Enhance opportunities for community engagement among public housing residents by providing support to strengthen resident associations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.i: Building on existing efforts, enhance police presence in public housing by developing enhanced strategies for police participation, such as continued augmentation of number of dedicated officers, enhanced training on community engagement with public housing residents, and enhanced relationship-building strategies for community service providers and police officers on public housing sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>SFHA, MOCJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.j: Create a centralized reporting process within SFPD to track and notify SFHA of violent incidents at their sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>SFHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 3.3: Provide Quality and Effective Education to at-Risk Communities

Strategy Rationale: Negative school-related experiences such as poor academic performance, truancy, and dropping out of school are predictors of later criminal and violent behavior. Almost 80% of SF homicide victims under the age of 30 had four or more years of high school dropouts. Improving the quality of education, increasing alternative educational opportunities, and developing effective strategies to address truancy and connectedness are critical to mitigating and preventing violence.

Outcome Indicators:
- Reduce truancy.
- Reduce violence on or en route to school campuses.
- Increase student leadership and competency in conflict mediation and non-violence.
- Increase parent involvement in the schools.
- Increase social-emotional and academic performance.

Strategies:
3.3.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.
3.3.b: Support the Partnership for Achievement between the City of San Francisco and SFUSD and strengthen mechanisms for SFUSD and city agencies to engage in effective program coordination to improve district-wide safety and academic performance among students from at-risk communities.
3.3.c: Support the launch of THE Center for Academic Reentry and Empowerment (CARE) for truancy reduction.
3.3.d: Support the development and implementation of a uniform violence prevention curriculum in San Francisco school districts that includes social-emotional and academic performance.
3.3.e: Strengthen the collaboration between SFUSD, MINI, SFUSD, and CBOs engaged in school-based violence prevention to enhance school safety protocols for all public schools. Consider the Summer School Safety Plan as a model.
3.3.f: Enhance school outreach to parents and incentives for parent involvement in the schools by developing strategies such as a “parent leader” program at the schools.

Lead Agencies:
- SFUSD
- SFUSD
- DCYF
- Mayor’s Office
- Interagency Council
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee

Key Partners:
- DCYF
- MINI
- SFUSD
- COO
- Stay in School Coalition

Timeframe:
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**OBJECTIVE 3.4: ENSURE SUCCESSFUL REENTRY FOR INDIVIDUALS EXITING THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS**

Strategy Rationale: Studies show a high rate of recidivism among people on parole and probation. Within three years of their release, 59% of California’s adult parolees recidivate and go back to state prison. In 2003, more than 2,500 felons were paroled to San Francisco, where the recidivism rate is closer to 70%. In response, many city agencies are invested in improving services and programs for individuals reentering San Francisco communities after incarceration. These efforts could be dramatically improved by enhancing supervision capacity and strengthening interagency coordination.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Reduce recidivism.
- Increase ex-offender stability (based on housing, employment, and other surrogate measures).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.</td>
<td>• Interagency Council • Violence Prevention Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• DA, PD, JPD, APD, MOCJ, Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.b: Develop a common definition of recidivism and a system to track recidivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.c: Establish reentry/release principles and practices (i.e., release dates, referrals, arrangements about the types of information probationers/parolees should be provided during release) and identify model local and national programs and best practices in re-entry.</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
<td>• DA, PD, JPD, APD, MOCJ, Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.d: Create a model programs/best practices re-entry matrix based on reentry/release principles to provide referrals and inform grant making/RFP process.</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
<td>• DA, PD, JPD, APD, MOCJ, Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.e: Consolidate the San Francisco Reentry Council and Safe Communities Reentry Coordinating Council into the San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council, to streamline reentry policy and planning.</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
<td>• DA, PD, JPD, APD, MOCJ, Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.f: Through the City’s Reentry Coordinating Council, implement a Strategic Plan for Reentry, and enhance coordination and working partnerships across agencies providing reentry services to increase use of services by re-entering individuals.</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
<td>• San Francisco Reentry Council, Safe Communities Reentry Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CHART CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE*
OBJECTIVE 3.4: ENSURE SUCCESSFUL REENTRY FOR INDIVIDUALS EXITING THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS (CONTINUED)

Strategy Rationale: Studies show a high rate of recidivism among people on parole and probation. In 2003, more than 2,500 felons were paroled to San Francisco. Within three years of their release 59% of California’s adult parolees recidivate and go back to state prison. In San Francisco the recidivism rate is closer to 70%. In response, many City agencies are invested in improving the services and programs for individuals reentering San Francisco communities after incarceration. These efforts could be dramatically improved by enhancing supervision capacity and strengthening interagency coordination.

Outcome Indicators:
- Reduce recidivism.
- Increase ex-offender stability (based on housing, employment, and other surrogate measures).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.g: Enhance reentry-focused job placement and housing placement programs by conducting a gaps analysis; either expand effective programs or develop model programs where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• MOEWD</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.h: Reduce probation caseloads and build the capacity of probation officers through enhanced resources and training opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• APD • JPD</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.i: Develop a uniform mechanism and coordinated case management system to assess needs and risks of reentering individuals, develop management plans, connect offenders with services pre-release, and track progress and outcomes post-release.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• APD • JPD</td>
<td>• Reentry Coordinating Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.j: Strengthen programs and incorporate models that assist ex-offenders to seal their criminal records such as the Public Defender’s “Clean Slate” program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OBJECTION 3.5: STRENGTHEN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND EMPOWERMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Strategy Rationale: Youth empowerment builds agency and authority in young people to promote well-being and harm reduction in their lives and their communities. Building the assets of young people serves to protect them from the negative dynamics of crime and violence.

#### Outcome Indicators:
- Increase youth’s positive and stable attachment to adults.
- Increase youth involvement in community/civic engagement activities.
- Increase youth access to leadership roles in programs and activities.

#### STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5.a</th>
<th>Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.b</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive assessment of the City’s youth development programs across City agencies and a uniform mechanism to evaluate and enhance such programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.c</td>
<td>Integrate uniform performance measures into grant guidelines for youth development and empowerment programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.d</td>
<td>Expand community capacity to provide effective youth development and empowerment programming in at-risk communities through multi-agency investment and uniform, strengthened training and consistent monitoring strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.e</td>
<td>Assess and strengthen opportunities for intergenerational engagement, faith-based community involvement, cultural competency, and gender specific services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.f</td>
<td>Expand peer mentoring, outreach, recruitment, and enrollment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LEAD AGENCIES
- Interagency Council
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee
- DCYF
- DPH, JPD, SFPD, SFUSD, MOCJ
- Interagency Council
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee
- DCYF
- SFUSD
- Interagency Council
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee
- DCYF
- SFUSD
OBJECTIVE 3.6: TRANSFORM COMMUNITY CONDITIONS AND EMPOWER RESIDENTS

Strategy Rationale: Community deterioration and lack of cohesiveness plague the City’s most violence prone neighborhoods. Social connectedness, resident involvement, and positive environmental changes can significantly promote safety and deter violent incidents.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Increase number of residents engaged in community programs.
- Increase community utilization of community programs and parks.
- Increase number of neighborhood beautification initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.6.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators. | | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • SFPD, MOCI,  
• DPH, MOCJ,  
• COO, DOE,  
• MOH, DPW |
| 3.6.b: Strengthen City agency coordination to clean up blight and make environmental improvements in high violence areas (i.e., lighting and greening projects). | | • Greening Director | • SFPD, MOCI, DPW, DPH, MONS, COO |
| 3.6.c: Strengthen neighborhood associations in high violence areas. | | • MOCJ | • SFPD  
• MOCI  
• DPH  
• COO |
| 3.6.d: Strengthen community outreach and public education strategies to promote community involvement and neighborhood empowerment efforts. Encourage key stakeholders that do not typically participate in such efforts to become actively engaged. | | • MOCJ | • DOE  
• COO  
• DPW |
| 3.6.e: Develop a comprehensive assessment of the City’s neighborhood beautification and community engagement programs across agencies and a uniform mechanism to evaluate and enhance this programming. | | • Greening Director | |
**OBJECTIVE 3.7: STRENGTHEN FAMILY SUPPORT AND SENIOR SUPPORT**

Strategy Rationale: Negative family dynamics are often cited as a root cause of later crime and violence for children. Family violence is precipitated by issues such as substance abuse, poverty, and incarceration. Family Support Services are designed to strengthen families by helping parents to raise safe and healthy children, supporting them to become self-sufficient, and encouraging them to take an active role in their communities. Additionally, as family members age, the responsibility of caring for elders often becomes the responsibility of family. The responsibility of caring for elders can cause stress and frustration for caregivers and sometimes leads to elder abuse.

### Outcome Indicators:
- Increase number of pregnant mothers who receive pre-natal care.
- Increase the number of neo-natal home visits.
- Increase number of expecting and current parents who receive parenting support and skills training.
- Increase number of teachers, social workers and CBOs trained in recognizing and responding to family violence.
- Increase number of low-income and at-risk families who receive comprehensive family support.

### STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.b: Ensure that families, especially those in greatest need, have access to high quality family support programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.c: Support the development and launch of Parent University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.d: Strengthen in-home support services for seniors and training for non-certified caregivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.e: Support the implementation of the Family Support Standards across the City’s family support programs, including the development and implementation of uniform assessment, evaluation, outcome tracking, and data reporting tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.f: Support training and ongoing assistance to provide high-quality family support services in accordance with the family support standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.g: Identify gaps in current family support service delivery system and develop a funding strategy to enhance existing as well as develop additional geographically based and citywide services for families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.h: Strengthen the capacity of City-funded programs to embrace and implement family-centered service delivery by providing training and ongoing technical assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEAD AGENCIES

- Interagency Council
- DCYF
- COO
- HSA
- DPH
- DPH

### KEY PARTNERS

- HSA, COO, DPH
- HSA, DPH, DCYF
- DPH
- HSA, COO
- DCYF
- DCYF
- Interagency Council
- Violence Prevention Advisory Committee
**OBJECTIVE 3.8: REDUCE THE IMPACT OF TRAUMA**

**Strategy Rationale:** Witnessing or experiencing violence is directly correlated with future risk of violent behavior. PTSD is a growing ailment in SF communities most impacted by violence. Helping individuals, families, and communities heal from violence is at the core of trauma reduction efforts. Providing comprehensive support and coordinated services to individuals and families who have witnessed or experienced violence is as important as reducing exposure to violent images and messages and supporting positive images.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Decrease number of children who witness violence in their homes.
- Reduce number of violent incidents that are the result of retaliation from prior violence.
- Increase number of victims accessing effective support and trauma reduction services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.8.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators. | | • Interagency Council  
• Violence Prevention Advisory Committee | • DPH  
• COO  
• DOSW |
| 3.8.b: Enhance multi-agency coordination of existing trauma reduction programs (i.e., CRT, CRN, victims services, Teen Trauma Recovery Center, Trauma Recovery Center, Wrap Around Project, SFUSD Wellness Centers). | | • DPH | • DPH  
• DCYF  
• HSA  
• COO  
• DOSW |
| 3.8.c: Develop a strategy to adjust overall deployment of mental health programs to be more geographically and home based. | | • DPH  
• HSA  
• DCYF | • DPH  
• COO  
• DOSW |
| 3.8.d: Strengthen protocols for identifying children exposed to violence and children with PTSD and enhance steps to connect them to services. | | • DPH | • HSA  
• DCYF |
| 3.8.e: Strengthen training for service providers, police, and teachers to respond to trauma related behavior. | | • DPH | • HSA  
• DCYF  
• COO  
• DOSW |
| 3.8.f: Strengthen faith-based component in community based healing and counseling strategies. | | • DPH | • HSA  
• DCYF  
• COO |
| 3.8.g: Promote the importance of self-care and adequate staff development to address the vicarious trauma experienced by service providers working with individuals in crisis. | | • DPH | • HSA  
• DCYF  
• COO  
• MOCJ |
| 3.8.h: Increase awareness of resources and services for victims of violence by developing a comprehensive resource guide each year. | | • DPH | • HSA  
• DCYF  
• COO |
| 3.8.i: Support efforts to strengthen and expand SF Safe Start program. | | • DA  
• DCYF | • DA  
• SFUSD  
• SafeStart  
• First 5 |
**OBJECTIVE 3.9: STRENGTHEN COMMUNITY POLICING**

**Strategy Rationale:** In many of San Francisco’s violence-prone neighborhoods there is severe mistrust between police and residents. Community Policing is a policing strategy and philosophy built on the premise that community interaction and support can help control crime, with community members helping to identify suspects and bring problems to the attention of police. To be effective, the community policing philosophy must be integrated into the culture and training of the police department and the community.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Complete the departmental assessment.
- Increase the number of community policing training opportunities in SFPD.
- Increase the number of officers trained in community policing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9.a: Implement the consensus recommendations of the Community Policing Advisory Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>Mayor, Police Commission MOCJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.b Utilize the Community Police Advisory Committee as a civilian oversight committee that is charged with monitoring implementation of community policing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>Police Commission, MOCJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.c: Build off the SFPD’s assessment of what it will take to fully implement a comprehensive community policing model that impacts all bureaus within the Department from the Academy to the beat officers to Gang Task Force to the Command Staff and implement the action plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>MOCJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.d: Expand community policing training for officers and community members through a collaborative effort between the Police Academy, SFUSD and community-based organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>SFUSD, School Resource Officers, CBO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.e: Develop a community policing strategy specific to San Francisco Housing Authority properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>SFHA, MOCJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.f: Increase language capacity throughout SFPD by ensuring District Stations and tip-lines, both anonymous and non-anonymous, are multilingual.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>MOCJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE 3.10: REDUCE HARMFUL IMPACT OF FIREARMS, ALCOHOL, AND DRUGS**

Strategy Rationale: The accessibility of firearms and the frequency with which they are used in disputes is alarming, often leading to lethal outcomes. The use of firearms is often coupled with alcohol and drug usage. Nationwide, alcohol is the drug most closely associated with violent incidents. The literature strongly suggests that alcohol, like other drugs, acts as a “multiplier” of crime. In neighborhoods where there is a concentration of liquor stores, that neighborhood often suffers from alcohol-related social problems.

### Outcome Indicators:

- Reduce the number of illegal firearms in San Francisco.
- Reduce the number of youth carrying firearms.
- Reduce the number of San Franciscans dependent on drugs and alcohol.
- Reduce the number of alcohol and drug related incidents.

### Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10.a: Establish a baseline measure and set targets for outcome indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.b: Expand parent accountability for youth/children carrying firearms and build a component of required parental involvement into Family Court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.c: Launch a public education campaign to send a strong message against gun violence and illegal gun activity emphasizing responsible gun ownership, educating youth about gun safety, increasing awareness of existing laws, and highlighting the danger of replicas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.d: Partner with local state and national elected officials to develop and advocate for legislation to reform hand gun laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.e: Strengthen efforts to stop straw purchasing (purchase of illegal firearms) and gun trafficking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.f: Strengthen law enforcement collaboration to remove guns from the street and respond uniformly to gun violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interagency Council**
**Violence Prevention Advisory Committee**
**MOCJ**
**SFPD, Courts**
**DA, HSA**
**DCYF, SFPD, DAPD, MOCJ**
**Mayor’s Office of Government Affairs**
**SFPD**
**MOCJ**
**MOCJ**
**DA, APD, JPD, City Attorney**
**SFPD, DA, APD, JPD, Sheriff**
Objective 3.10: Reduce Harmful Impact of Firearms, Alcohol, and Drugs (Continued)

Strategy Rationale: The accessibility of firearms and the frequency with which they are used in disputes is alarming because they often lead to lethal outcomes. The use of firearms is often coupled with alcohol and drug usage. Nationwide, alcohol is the drug most closely associated with violent incidents. The literature strongly suggests that alcohol, like other drugs, acts as a “multiplier” of crime. In neighborhoods where there is a concentration of liquor stores, that neighborhood often suffers from alcohol-related social problems.

**Outcome Indicators:**
- Reduce the number of illegal firearms in San Francisco.
- Reduce the number of youth carrying firearms.
- Reduce the number of San Franciscans dependent on drugs and alcohol.
- Reduce the number of alcohol and drug related incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
<th>KEY PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10.g: Strengthen coordination across City and regional agencies responsible for code enforcement, drug and alcohol education, and drug and alcohol prevention and treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCJ</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.h: Strengthen education for children on negative impact of drug and alcohol addiction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH, SFUSD</td>
<td>DPH, HSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.i: Develop a neighborhood-based public education campaign about drugs and alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>DCYF, HSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.j: Strengthen merchants’ involvement in alcohol and drug abuse prevention.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>DPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.k: Create a comprehensive assessment of existing drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs, identify training and capacity building needs, and develop a system for ongoing monitoring and evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>HSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>