

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R1	In response to the "San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Community Policy Working Groups Overview," the Police Commission representative made the following comments to all working group members: - Non-members who can provide useful information may be invited as guest speakers, but this must be arranged in advance through the working group facilitator. - "Replying all" to emails between working group members may constitute a meeting, potentially violating open meeting laws. If a working group member wants to share specific documents, they should do so in advance through the working group facilitator to ensure everyone receives them before the next meeting. - The 120-business day completion timeline for a given working group is flexible. An extension can be requested if more meetings are needed to complete the work and robust discussions are ongoing. - Working Group members, including officers, can influence policy outside the working group process. The commission takes public comments, and concerns regarding Department General Orders (DOs) or recommendations made in the WG can be addressed at the commission level once the DO is agendaized for discussion.	N/A	9/17/24		The Department values the insights shared by the Police Commission representative during the meeting. Additionally, it is important to note that after the working group process concludes, the draft DO is posted on the Department's website for 30 business days, allowing the public, including working group members to provide additional feedback.	Closed
R2	A working group member asked if a redlined version of the Stage I draft for DO 6.16 could be provided.	N/A	9/17/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department will provide a redlined version of the Stage I draft for DO 6.16 before the next meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2024.	Closed
R3	A working group member asked if, in the event they cannot attend a meeting, another colleague from their organization could attend in their place.	N/A	9/17/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DO	The working group facilitator stated that a member can send a designee in their absence, provided that each organization has only one vote on matters requiring a vote in the meeting.	Closed
R4	A working group member asked whether the Stage I draft includes procedures for officers working at the airport, given that trafficking, domestic violence, and sexual assaults are significant issues there, and officers at the airport are usually exempt from such procedures.	N/A	9/17/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department has reinstated the language from the currently active version into draft DO 6.16: "Airport Bureau members shall follow Airport Bureau General Orders and San Mateo County protocols."	Closed
R5	During the Officer Panel Q/A, the following issues were identified for potential revisions of draft DO 6.16: 1. Ensuring timely notifications to the Special Victims Unit (SVU) by Patrol Officers initially responding to the scene. 2. Familiarizing Patrol Officers with the written call-out criteria to notify SVU, and clarifying how it differs from the criteria for SVU to respond. 3. Changing the wording in Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (A) from "Initial Response" to "Patrol Initial Response". 4. Ensuring Patrol Officers ask detailed questions to establish the occurrence of sexual crimes before notifying SVU. 5. Changing the "2-day timeline" to "2-business day timeline" in Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (C) (3) for picking up Sexual Assault Evidence Kit (SAEK) from the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center after SVU notification. 6. Establishing protocols for Patrol Officers when outside law enforcement agencies completing a courtesy report for a sexual assault don't wait for SVU to pick up the SAEK.	N/A	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	The issues identified in this recommendation will be addressed when corresponding sections of draft DO are discussed in the future working group meetings.	Open
R6	During Officer Panel Q/A, the working group discussed the following points: 1. The current notification process between patrol officers and SVU. 2. Whether patrol officers have a checklist of questions to identify crimes. 3. The possibility of using CA POST minimum facts interview questions as a guide for determining if a crime occurred. 4. Evaluating if the current training for patrol officers is sufficient for recognizing sexual crimes and/or appropriately notify SVU, or if additional training is necessary. 5. Improving collaboration between CPS and patrol officers to reduce repetitive minimal facts interview questions and minimize retraumatization of child victims while allowing for necessary clarifying questions. 6. Addressing public confusion, particularly among educators, about correct authorities to initially report child abuse, including sexual abuse. 7. Potential conflicts with Proposition 115 requirements that officers must hear information firsthand to testify in preliminary hearings.	N/A	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	For 1 and 2, the response was provided by the SME for DO 6.16 and other SFPD members participating in the working group and/or Officer Panel. For 3-7, they will be addressed during the discussion of corresponding sections of draft DO in the future working group meetings.	Open
R7	A working group member requested clarification on whether the primary audience for DO 6.16 is Patrol, SVU, or a combination of both.	N/A	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DO	The Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DO 6.16 and other Department members in the working group explained that the primary audience for DO 6.16 includes SFPD members, particularly patrol officers and sergeants, to guide them in properly responding to sexual assault reports. However, certain sections are specifically targeted at SVU investigators handling these cases.	Closed
R8	A working group member requested digital copies of the documents listed in the "References" section of Draft DO 6.16.	N/A	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DO	The Community Working Group Facilitator provided digital copies of requested materials to all working group members on October 11, 2024. Additionally, the requested materials are posted on the "Policy Working Groups" webpage as supporting materials for the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2024, under "DO 6.16 (Sexual Assault Investigations)".	Closed
R9	A working group member asked a question regarding the need to include value statements in the "Purpose" section of Draft DO 6.16, arguing that DOs should serve as practical tools for SFPD members rather than a means to capture organizational values. The subsequent discussion generated the following brainstorming ideas: 1. Keeping the "Purpose" section concise while ensuring policies and procedures reflect organizational values. 2. Dividing the "Purpose" section into two paragraphs: the first addressing the DO's purpose, and the second including value statements. 3. Considering moving the "Policy" section immediately after "Purpose" to emphasize SFPD values, particularly for readers such as victims of sexual assault. 4. Emphasizing the importance of DOs as practical documents for SFPD members and as public statements of Department Policies.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Previous Language: "The purpose of this order is to establish general policies and procedures for a trauma-informed approach to sexual assault investigations that prioritizes community values, the well-being of survivors, and ensures Safety with Respect". New Proposed Language: "The purpose of this order is to establish general policies and procedures when responding to and investigating reports of sexual assault cases. The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is committed to a victim-centered approach in sexual assault investigations: ensuring respectful and empathetic interactions, building trust, minimizing re-traumatization, and understanding victims' varying life circumstances often requiring additional awareness and resources".	Closed
R10	A working group member asked about the sources of the definitions in the draft DO section, "Definitions," particularly questioning if the definition of sexual assault is a legal one. The ensuing discussion considered changing "Sexual Assault" to "Sexual Crimes."	1	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Update 11/08/24: The working group decided to retain the original term, "Sexual Assault" at the working group meeting that was conducted on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. See R# 23.	Closed
R11	A working group member inquired whether sexual harassment could be included in the list of sex crimes under the definition of Sexual Assault.	1	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DO	Sexual harassment is not classified as the type of sexual crime investigated under the guidelines of DO 6.16.	Closed
R12	A working group member proposed adding the Children Advocacy Center and Human Services Agency to the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART). The discussion that followed then considered substituting the Children Advocacy Center with the Children Advocacy, Support, and Resources Center (CASARC), as it is more familiar to members. They also debated whether the SART definition should specify the names of participating agencies or focus on their roles, considering that agency names might change in the future. Ultimately, the working group recommended including "Human Services Agency Protective Services Workers" in the list of SART members.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The definition of SART was updated to include the "Human Services Agency Protective Service Workers".	Closed
R13	A working group member recommended to update the definition of SART Examination with the suggested language, "A forensic-medical examination conducted by a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE). During a SART Examination, the victim will be offered: 1. Forensic documentation of injuries and collection of evidentiary products for purposes of a law enforcement investigation, and 2. Medical evaluation and treatment".	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "A forensic, medical examination conducted by a SANE. Injuries, wounds, evidence, and the survivor's statement are documented during the examination. Post-exposure prophylaxis and therapeutic medications may be provided at the examination". New Proposed Language: "A multidisciplinary team working collaboratively to meet the medical and emotional needs of the sexual assault victim and the forensic needs of the criminal justice system. This team includes, but is not limited to advocates, law enforcement officers (including prosecutors), forensic interviewers, Human Services Agency (HSA) protective services workers, and Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners (SAFEs)".	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R14	A working group member asked if the definition of the SVU should include other areas of investigation beyond sexual assault that fall under SVU's purview, considering the intersectionality between sexual assault and these other areas. During the discussion on this recommendation, a working group member suggested including the description of SVU in draft DO 1.01, which is currently in the final stage of an update.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	The definition of SVU was updated to read as follows: "A unit in the Investigations Bureau responsible for the investigation of sensitive crimes including all reported cases of sexual assault regardless of the age of the victim". Additionally, draft DO 1.01 doesn't include the descriptions of individual units falling under a given bureau. To remain consistent, the description of SVU is not added to draft DO 1.01. This also provides flexibility for the Chief of Police to adjust the scope of investigations for Departmental units as needed.	Closed
R15	A working group member suggested replacing the definition of "Advocate" in draft DO 6.16 with the definition of "Victim Advocate" from the "International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Model Policy for Investigating Sexual Assaults (2017)". The ensuing discussion considered the need to include information about privileged communication between some community-based or rape crisis victim advocates and sexual assault victims; ultimately deciding to address potentially in the "Victim Interviews" section of draft DO 6.16.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	The Department updated the language of "Advocate" with slight modification from what was proposed to be inclusive of advocates from governmental and non-governmental agencies. Previous Language: "Advocate: A civilian representative of a non-government agency, included in the SART via a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or contract with the City and/or participating City agencies, that has undergone specialized training in the SART process, laws, and procedures". New Proposed Language: "Victim Advocate. A service provider, rape crisis counselor, social worker, victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support".	Closed
R16	A working group member suggested replacing "victim" with "survivor" to ensure consistency throughout the DO.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	To maintain consistency, the Department decided to replace "survivor" with "victim," as the latter term is more commonly used and legally precise for law enforcement investigations. Update 11/08/24: This recommendation will undergo further internal discussion within the Department. If not resolved by the end of the working group meetings, it will be addressed by Department Leadership during subsequent stages of the DO Update. The working group facilitator will ensure all members are kept informed of the Department's response.	Open
R17	In response to the Department's changes to the draft DO based on Recommendation #9, a working group member reiterated their prior suggestion to incorporate value statements in the "Policy" section and consider placing this section immediately after the "Purpose" section in the draft DO. They emphasized that while it is beneficial to mention value statements in the "Purpose" section, it is more crucial that the protocols followed by officers in the field are grounded in these values, suggesting a better placement in the "Policy" section. On the other hand, another working group member argued that while it is important for procedures followed during interactions with sexual assault victims to be based on these values, it is equally important to include the value statements at the beginning of the draft DO. This approach ensures that officers are reminded of the SFPD's values when dealing with sexual assault victims.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	To maintain consistency in the formatting of all Department General Orders, the Department will retain the original sequence of sections: Purpose, Definitions, and Policy. The value statements will remain within the 'Purpose' section. However, the Department plans to update the procedures throughout the draft DO based on recommendations generated in future working group meetings to ensure they align with the values outlined in the 'Purpose' section	Open
R18	The working group recommended to add the following to the list of entities mentioned in the newly proposed definition of "Victim Advocate" in the draft DO: 1. Advocate or Domestic Violence Advocate to be inclusive of domestic violence advocates given the intersectionality of domestic violence and sexual assault cases. 2. A person of the survivor's choosing The subsequent discussion included a suggestion to add clarifying language regarding the person of the survivor's choosing. This clarification would ensure that the person chosen is not involved in any capacity with the case, preventing potential issues for the investigation.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The definition of "Victim Advocate" was updated to read as follows: "A service provider, rape crisis counselor, domestic violence advocate, social worker, or victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency or someone of victim's choosing as long as not involved in any capacity with the case, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support".	Open
R19	A working group member reiterated their recommendation to change the term "victim" to "victim/survivor," as most agencies serving sexual assault victims prefer the term "survivor" to be more trauma-informed. The subsequent discussion included considering adding a definition of "survivor" to the "Definitions" section of the draft DO and potentially including language regarding the interchangeable use of the terms "survivor" and "victim."	N/A	10/15/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will undergo further internal discussion within the Department. If not resolved by the end of the working group meetings, it will be addressed by Department Leadership during subsequent stages of the DO Update. The working group facilitator will ensure all members are kept informed of the Department's response	Open
R20	A working group member inquired whether it would be beneficial to use an alternative definition of "SART" found online which is much shorter, instead of the one currently included in the draft DO. The recommended language is as follows: "SART is a group of agencies that provides a team approach to care and services for sexual assault survivors. Our goals are to help survivors know their options and rights, and to provide high quality care for all survivors in our community".	1	10/15/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024.	Open
R21	The working group discussed the need to revise the newly proposed definition of "Consent" in the draft DO, as it was deemed too broad. The discussion included the following points: 1. Potentially including an in-depth definition of "consent" in the training materials. 2. Clarifying what "consent" means in the context of this DO is important because officers' primary role is to document and investigate the crime reported by a victim/survivor. The determination of consent holds more significance during court proceedings than during the initial investigation led by officers following this DO. 3. Consider adding a clarification that the definition of consent in the draft DO is presented from the victim's perspective. 4. Determining whether the proposed definition of "consent" encompasses the consent given by the victim/survivor to be transported to a hospital for forensic examination. 5. Questioning the need to define "consent" in the draft DO, given its limited mention elsewhere in the document. 5. Removal of the definition of "consent" from the draft DO due to its lack of relevance during the investigation phase of reported sexual assault crimes. Based on consensus, the working group ultimately decided to remove the definition of consent from the draft DO.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department removed the newly added definition of "Consent" from the draft DO.	Open
R22	A working group member recommended using the phrase "Trauma Recovery Center/Rape Treatment Center" instead of "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center" in draft DO section 6.16.04 (C) [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment]. Another member recommended using "Rape Treatment Center (RTC)/Child Advocacy Support and Resource Center (CASARC)" instead of the previously recommended term.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term, "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center (RTC)" was changed to "Rape Treatment Center (RTC)/Child Advocacy, Support, and Resource Center (CASARC)".	Open
R23	The working group decided to retain the term "Sexual Assault" in the "Definitions" section of the draft DO and to keep its current definition unchanged.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department kept the original language for the definition of Sexual Assault.	Open
R24	A working group member recommended to include mental health providers within the definition of SART.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term, "mental health providers" was added to the list of entities mentioned in the definition of "SART".	Open
R25	A working group member inquired if there is a need to include the definition of "minimal facts interview" from the "CA POST - Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation - Guideline 7: Initial/First Responding Officer Minimal Facts Victim Interview", within the "Definitions" section of draft DO. The subsequent discussion considered including the details of the minimal facts interview in the "Procedures" section of the draft DO.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024.	Open
R26	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (A) [Patrol Initial Response] - A working group member inquired whether the listed bullet points in this section are meant to outline the in-depth details officers should not ask during the initial response, or if they are part of the general information collection. They added that since the bullet points appear to represent the general information collected during the initial response, the section might need to be rephrased for clarity.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "After medical aid has been offered, members should attempt to collect general information from the survivor, without the need for in-depth details. Such details should include....." Proposed New Language: "After medical aid has been offered, members should attempt to collect general information from the victim (or witness, in case if victim is incapacitated to provide the information directly), without the need for in-depth details. The general information to be collected includes but is not limited to.....".	Open

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R27	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (A) [Patrol Initial Response] - A working group recommended addressing the "minimal facts interview" in this section and changing the term "victim" to "victim/witness" to account for situations where it is not possible to obtain initial information directly from the victim e.g. elderly with dementia or comatose patient. The subsequent discussion considered any conflicts with Proposition 115 requirements in regards to the later part of recommendation.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Additional language was added under "General Information Collection" to specifically direct members to refer to "Juvenile Victim Interviews" section to ensure alignment with the requirement of conducting minimal facts interview in case of juvenile victims. Inclusion of the phrase, "minimal facts interview" and its elements will be further discussed in the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024. In addition, the following phrase, "or witness, in case if victim is incapacitated to provide the information directly" under the general information collection by the patrol officer in case of adult victims.	Open
R28	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (B) [Notifications] - A working group member inquired about who is responsible for making the legally required notifications as outlined in the "CA POST - Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation - Guideline 4: First Responding Officer Responsibilities." These notifications include: 1. Completion of the Suspected Child Abuse Report (SCAR) form SS 8572 within 36 hours (11166(k) PC). 2. Immediate phone, fax or electronic notification to CPS/CWS. 3. Forwarding the completed SS 8572 to CPS/CWS, the District Attorney's Office and any other required agencies. The ensuing discussion included the following points: 1. Adding language about notification to CPS by the patrol officer if the victim is a juvenile. 2. Considering the placement of the language regarding notification to CPS before the patrol officer begins collecting general information, as outlined in the "Patrol Initial Response" section of the draft DO. 3. Checking the SFPD DO related to Child Abuse Investigations, if any, to ensure that SCAR reporting is mentioned.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Two sections of draft DO, "Patrol Initial Response" and "Notifications", were reorganized in a manner to include notification process under patrol initial response. The sub-section for "Notifications" was divided into "Notification to CPS" and Notification to SVU"	Open
R29	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (C) [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended updating the language regarding the collection of SAEK by SVU within two business days of notification, noting that the current protocol does not involve the RTC/CASARC notifying SVU. Instead, SVU comes to the RTC/CASARC every other day to pick up any SAEKs.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "Once notified by the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center, a member assigned to SVU shall respond to the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center and take custody of the SAEK no later than two days from the date of notification". Proposed New Language: "SVU or designee shall take custody of the SAEK from the RTC/CASARC no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted".	Open
R30	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (C) [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended establishing a uniform timeline of two business days for retrieving a SAEK from another jurisdiction.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency". Proposed New Language: "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted".	Open
R31	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (C) [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - The working group recommended including the term 'designee' for instances when a SAEK must be picked up from another jurisdiction. This addition ensures inclusivity, acknowledging that an SVU Investigator may designate someone else to retrieve the kit.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term "designee" was added as recommended in the following sentence, "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted".	Open
R32	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (C) [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended to change "nursing staff" to "medical staff" in this section.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department changed the term, "nursing" to "medical" in this section.	Open