DGO 6.16 - SFPD Policy Working Group Recommendations and Discussion Tracking as of 1/17/2025

#	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 (DGOs) or recommendations made in the WG can be addressed at the commission level once the DGO is agendized 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 DGO 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 DGO 6.16 could be provided.	N/A	**9/17/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department will provide a redlined version of the Stage I draft for DGO 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 DGO	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 DGO	The Department has reinstated the language from the currently active version into draft DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO in the future working group meetings.	Open
R7	A working group member requested clarification on whether the primary audience for DGO 6.16 is Patrol, SVU, or a combination of both.	N/A	**10/3/24**	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 and other Department members in the working group explained that the primary audience for DGO 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 DGO 6.16.	N/A	**10/3/24**	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	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 "DGO 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 DGO 6.16, arguing that DGOs 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 DGO'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 DGOs as practical documents for SFPD members and as public statements of Department Policies.	1	**10/3/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	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 DGO 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 reatin 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 DGO	Sexual harassment is not classified as the type of sexual crime investigated under the guidelines of DGO 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 DGO	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 DGO	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
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 DGO 1.01, which is currently in the final stage of an update.	1	**10/3/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	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 DGO 1.01 doesn't include the descriptions of individual units falling under a given bureau. To remain consisent, the description of SVU is not added to draft DGO 1.01. This also provides flexibility for the Chief of Police to adjust the scope of investigations for Departmental units as needed.	Closed

DGO 6.16 - SFPD Policy Working Group Recommendations and Discussion Tracking as of 1/17/2025

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
R15	A working group member suggested replacing the definition of "Advocate" in draft DGO 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 DGO 6.16.	1	**10/3/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	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 DGO.	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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO. 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 DGO. 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 DGO	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 DGO based on recommendations generated in future working group meetings to ensure they align with the values outlined in the 'Purpose' section	Closed
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 DGO: 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 DGO	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".	Closed
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 DGO 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 DGO 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 DGO. 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 will not be included in Draft DGO	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Update 11/12/2024: The working group decided to not use the newly recommended language and keep the more expansive definition of SART as it currently stands.	Closed
R21	The working group discussed the need to revise the newly proposed definition of "Consent" in the draft DGO, 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 DGO 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 DGO. 3. Consider adding a clarification that the definition of consent in the draft DGO is presented from the victim's perspective. 3. Determining whether the proposed definition of "consent" encompasses the consent given by the victim/survivor to be transported to a hospital for forensic examination. 4. Questioning the need to define "consent" in the draft DGO, given its limited mention elsewhere in the document. 5. Removal of the definition of "consent" from the draft DGO 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 DGO.	1	**10/15/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department removed the newly added definition of "Consent" from the draft DGO.	Closed
R22	A working group member recommended using the phrase "Trauma Recovery Center/Rape Treatment Center" instead of "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center" in draft DGO 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 DGO	The term, "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center (RTC)" was changed to "Rape Treatment Center (RTC)/Child Advocacy, Support, and Resource Center (CASARC)".	Closed
R23	The working group decided to retain the term "Sexual Assault" in the "Definitions" section of the draft DGO and to keep its current definition unchanged.	1	**10/15/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department kept the original language for the definition of Sexual Assault.	Closed
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 DGO	The term, "mental health providers" was added to the list of enities mentioned in the definition of "SART".	Closed
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 DGO. The subsequent discussion considered including the details of the minimal facts interview in the "Procedures" section of the draft DGO.	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. Update 11/12/2024**:** This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, December 10, 2024. Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 47	Closed
R26	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO	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.....". Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 43	Closed
R27	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 confilicts with Proposition 115 requirements in regards to the later part of recommendation.	2	**10/15/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	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 juveline victims. Inclusion of the phrase, "minimal facts interview" and it's elements will be further discussed in the next working group meeting that's scheudled 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. Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 43	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
R28	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO. 3. Checking the SFPD DGO 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 DGO	Two sections of draft DGO, "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"	Closed
R29	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO	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".	Closed
R30	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO	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".	Closed
R31	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO	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".	Closed
R32	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [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 DGO	The Department changed the term, "nursing" to "medical" in this section.	Closed
R33	A working group member recommended to revise the proposed new language for the definition of an "Victim Advocate" to correctly place the mention of "a person of victim/survivor's choosing as their advocate" within the updated definition.	1	**11/12/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "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". Proposed New Language: "A service provider, rape crisis counselor, domestic violence advocate, social worker, or 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. A victim/survivor may choose an individual not defined as a Victim Advocate to serve as their support person, as long as the individual is not involved in any capacity with the case".	Closed
R34	A working group member inquired about the rationale behind including sexual assault investigation protocols for both adults and juveniles within the same general order.	N/A	**11/12/24**	Administrative Question and Answer- not for inclusion in DGO	During the working group meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 explained that there used to be a separate "Juvenile Division," but now the investigation of sexual assaults for both adults and juveniles falls under the Special Victims Unit (SVU). Additionally, an SVU representative mentioned that the investigative process for both adult and juvenile victims is largely the same, which is why they are included in the same general order, making it simpler for all officers to implement.	Closed
R35	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications to SVU] -** A working group member suggested revising the language in this section to ensure that a member must speak directly with a live person within SVU to report an alleged sexual assault. If a live person cannot be reached, members should be instructed to contact the Department of Operations Center (DOC).	2	**11/12/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "Business Hours: In all cases where an individual alleges that a sexual assault has occurred, even if an arrest is not made, members shall notify SVU main telephone number as soon as practical". Proposed New Language: "Business Hours: In all cases where an individual alleges that a sexual assault has occurred, even if an arrest is not made, members shall notify the SVU by calling the main telephone number and speaking with a live person as soon as practical. If a live person within the SVU cannot be reached, members shall notify the Department Operations Center (DOC)".	Closed
R36	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications to SVU] -** A working group member asked whether a specific timeframe could be provided for notifying SVU of a reported sexual assault, instead of using the phrase "as soon as practical." This suggestion was made in light of comments from the Officer Panel Q/A emphasizing the importance of timely notification to SVU for reported sexual assaults by patrol officers.	2	**11/12/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	During the meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 and other Department members explained that assigning a specific timeframe for patrol officers to notify SVU of a reported sexual assault would conflict with their immediate requirement to inform CPS and ensure crime scene safety before notifying SVU. However, to ensure timely notifications to SVU, the section now includes a requirement for patrol officers to speak with a live person within SVU during business hours, and if this is not possible, to notify the DOC.	Closed
R37	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] -** The working group recommended revising the language concerning the collection of SAEKs involving outside law enforcement agencies. Specifically, they suggested including procedures for instances when the RTC/CASARC has completed and collected the SAEK from a sexual assault victim for an assault that occurred in another jurisdiction. The discussion also emphasized the importance of ensuring patrol officers understand that all SAEKs must be collected by the SVU or its designee. Officers should not direct outside law enforcement agencies to contact RTC/CASARC for the collection of SAEKs in cases where the sexual assault occurred in another jurisdiction.	3	**11/12/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	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 or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted". Proposed New Language: "If an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, or if the RTC/CASARC has completed and collected the SAEK for a sexual assault that occurred in another jurisdiction, the SVU or its designee shall be responsible for collecting the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency or from RTC/CASARC, respectively, no later than two business days after the forensic examination. Members should direct outside law enforcement agency representatives to contact SVU directly regarding the collection of the SAEK".	Closed
R38	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member highlighted challenges faced by some victims/survivors, particularly at some district stations, where they had to report a sexual assault through plexiglass while neighbors waited in line to report their own crimes. They recommended revising the language regarding privacy during victim interviews in this section to elaborate on its importance in the DGO and to offer victims/survivors reasonably available private locations for interviews. The ensuing discussion included the following suggestions to emphasize the importance of privacy: - Adding a "shall" to ensure officers ask victims/survivors about their preferred location for reporting a sexual crime and accommodate them as reasonably as possible. - Urging members to inform victims/survivors of their procedural right to privacy during an interview to report a sexual crime and offer reasonably available options for private locations. - Providing a handout at the beginning of an interview listing a few private place options and allowing victims/survivors to choose the one they are most comfortable with. - Utilizing private spaces at the offices of sexual assault advocacy groups. - Posting signs at district stations encouraging sexual assault victims to call a phone number to report a sexual crime in a reasonably available private space. - Ensuring privacy for victims from non-police and community members.	3 and 4	**11/12/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	In response to R#38 and R#39, the Department proposed the following language for the "Adult Victim Interviews" section. This aims to address the request for more detailed guidelines on ensuring victim privacy during sexual assault reporting, and to clarify the role of patrol officers in collecting additional information as necessary at the direction of SVU or their supervisor, especially when SVU is not responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting. *"Adult Victim Interviews:* *a. If the victim is reporting a sexual assault, members shall make reasonable efforts to allow the victim to select a private and comfortable location for the interview that is free from distractions.* *b. If the on-call SVU team determines they will respond to take over the investigation, members shall limit the initial interview to questions that establish only the basic facts of the assault. This includes information necessary for the immediate needs of the investigation and the safety of the victim, such as the suspect's identity and elements of the crime, when reasonable and practical. Members should tailor their questions to the victim's emotional and physical state.* *c. If the on-call SVU team determines they will NOT respond to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members shall continue to collect any additional information as necessary, as directed by their supervisor or SVU, that is reasonably possible. This will occur before a thorough follow-up interview is conducted at a later time.*	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
R39	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member inquired about the circumstances under which the on-call SVU team determines they will not take over an investigation, and whether this decision means the interview progresses beyond the preliminary stage to an in-depth interview. They added that if a Patrol Officer is required to conduct an in-depth interview, providing privacy and a support person should not be discretionary. The ensuing discussion included the following inquiries and recommendations: - Whether the timing of the interview is still determined by the victim, as mentioned in this section for in-depth victim interviews, in cases where a Patrol Officer conducts the interview. - What constitutes a "preliminary interview" and whether responding officers are trained to know the stopping point before transitioning into an in-depth interview. - Possibly removing the language suggesting patrol officers may conduct an in-depth interview, if that's not the practice. - Adding "at the direction of SVU" at the end of the phrase, "If it is determined by the on-call team at SVU that SVU is NOT responding to take over the investigation, members shall conduct an in-depth interview of the victim."	3 and 4	**11/12/24**	Administrative Question and Answer- not for inclusion in DGO	During the meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 and other SVU representatives in the working group explained that SVU may not immediately take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting for various reasons. These include situations where the victim wants to make a statement and leave because they are tired or emotionally drained, or where it is not optimal for an SVU investigator to conduct an in-depth interview immediately after the incident, provided there are no exigent circumstances. Additionally, more time between the initial and follow-up interviews can allow the victim to arrange for a support person or advocate to be present during the thorough in-depth interview conducted by an investigator. Furthermore, they clarified that SVU will still conduct a follow-up in-depth interview at a later time, even if they do not immediately take over the investigation. While patrol officers may ask a few follow-up questions to the victim at the direction of their supervisor or SVU, this does not replace the need for a comprehensive in-depth follow-up interview by an SVU investigator at a later time. Also, see response to R# 38.	Closed
R40	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended replacing "24 hours" with "one to two sleep cycles" in the following sentence: "Victim dictates the time of the interview depending on their trauma, in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours before they can articulate the details of the reported sexual assault." The ensuing discussion included the following points: - Removing the phrase "in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours." - Removing the sentence altogether, as the DGO is meant to provide direction to Patrol Officers and the sentence pertains to interviews conducted by SVU investigators. - Rephrasing the sentence to tailor it for providing necessary direction to Patrol Officers when the victim is not ready for an in-depth interview. - Balancing the best practice of allowing the victim to dictate the time for an in-depth interview with the need to meet immediate legal requirements, such as timely presentation of the case to the District Attorney. - Keeping the sentence but possibly modifying it to emphasize the sense of empowerment and control for the victim.	3 and 4	**11/12/24**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	The following sentence was removed from this section: "Victim dictates the time of the interview depending on their trauma, in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours before they can articulate the details of the reported sexual assault." This is because it pertains more to in-depth follow-up interviews conducted by an SVU Investigator, which are already covered by their unit order guidelines. The "Adult Victim Interviews" section in this DGO primarily addresses initial interviews conducted by Patrol Officers, so there is no need to include directives for SVU investigators here.	Closed
R41	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended replacing the term "private" with "non-public" when specifying the location for interviews in this section. The ensuing discussion included the following key points: - It may not always be feasible to provide a private location for an interview with a sexual assault victim in a busy police station, especially during shift changes, when other officers may be present. - There might be advocates, forensic examiners, or individuals chosen by the victim present during the interview. - Retaining the term "private" is important for the victim's comfort level in sharing details of the assault, particularly after experiencing such a violation. - Considering the use of the phrase "non-public and/or private" as an alternative. - The term "private" can be restrictive for police officers, particularly when providing a private location is impossible, which may cause unnecessary delays or policy violations. - Recommending the replacement of "shall" with "should" to provide more flexibility while maintaining the best practice of finding a private location whenever reasonably possible.	2 and 3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	**Previously Proposed Language:** *"If the victim is reporting a sexual assault, members shall make reasonable efforts to allow the victim to select a private and comfortable location for the interview that is free from distractions".* **Proposed New Language:** *"Members should make reasonable efforts to provide a non-public and comfortable location that is free from distractions and provides as much privacy as reasonably possible".*	Open
R42	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended adding the phrase "by SVU" when referencing follow-up interviews in this section. This change aims to specify that these interviews will be conducted by the Special Victims Unit (SVU).	2 and 3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Follow-up interviews during sexual assault cases may not always be conducted solely by the SVU. Other entities, such as the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, may also be involved. To maintain flexibility and acknowledge that follow-up interviews may be conducted by entities other than the SVU, this recommendation will not be included in the draft DGO 6.16.	Open
R43	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended refining the language concerning the limitation of initial interviews to only the basic facts of an assault. This refinement is suggested to prevent the appearance of inconsistent facts when comparing information gathered in different interviews throughout the investigation, which could lead to prosecution challenges in court.	2 and 3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The following actions were taken to address this recommendation: 1. Eliminated "Patrol Initial Response" section. 2. Moved the language pertaining to general information collection from the "General Information Collection" to the "Adult Victim Interviews". 3. "Notifications" section was made as its own. 4. "Adult Victim Interviews" section of the draft DGO was updated to read as follows: "***a. Initial Victim Interview:*** *After medical aid, members should conduct an initial interview with the victim (or witness if victim is incapacitated) to establish the nature of the crime committed. This will occur before a thorough follow-up interview that may be conducted later. Questions should be tailored to the victim's emotional and physical state. Information to be collected includes:* *• Type and elements of crime(s). • Location and timeframe of the incident. • Suspect information, description, and/or whereabouts • Potential crime scene and/or evidence information.* ***b. Initial Interview Location:*** *Members should make reasonable efforts to provide a non-public and comfortable location that is free from distractions and provides as much privacy as reasonably possible.* ***c. SVU Response:*** *• If the on-call SVU team determines they will take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members should limit their questioning to initial interview questions as mentioned above.* *• If the on-call SVU team determined they will NOT take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members shall continue to collect any additional information as directed by their patrol supervisor or SVU investigator".* 5. "Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment" section was moved after the "Victim Interviews"	Open
R44	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A member of the working group raised a question about whether law enforcement could collect information regarding the sexual assault of an adult victim from an advocate or another trustworthy adult with whom the victim has already shared the information. The purpose of this approach would be to avoid retraumatizing the victim by conducting multiple interviews. Their concern was whether this practice might lead to hearsay challenges in court.	N/A	**12/10/24**	Administrative Question and Answer- not for inclusion in DGO	The District Attorney's Office and advocates present during the working group provided a response stating that an advocate could not be used to gather any information shared by the victim. This is due to confidentiality rules between the advocate and the victim, which, if breached, could lead to the advocate becoming a witness.	Open
R45	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended adding language to this section that affirms the right of an adult sexual assault victim to have an advocate or a person of their choosing present during any interview.	2 and 3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The draft DGO 6.16 already incorporates the recommended language within the legal guidelines. These guidelines will be discussed in future working group meetings.	Open
R46	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended to rearrange the bullet points in this section to ensure it aligns with the chronoligical occurrence of events.	3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Juvenile Victim Interviews Section of the Draft DGO 6.16 was updated to read as follows: *"Juvenile Victims:* *a. In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving the SFPD SVU and CPS shall be conducted. Although the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) does not have investigative authority, it supports SVU and CPS during the investigation. Note that the investigative focus of the SVU may differ from that of the social worker.* *b. Due to the sensitive nature of these crimes, the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.* *c. If enough information about the nature of the crime and immediate actions is obtained from a reliable adult, members should avoid further questioning the child.* *d.* ***Minimal Facts Interview*** *: When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted.* *e.* ***Multi-Disciplinary Interview (MDI)*** *: In juvenile cases, an MDI is conducted later to gather information about abuse allegations. This interview supports fair decision-making in the justice and child protection systems, carried out by a trained, neutral professional using research-based techniques. Key partners include the Office of the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, SFPD, Department of Public Health, and Office of the City Attorney".*	Open
R47	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] -** A member of the working group recommended incorporating language on "minimal facts interviews" in this section, referencing the 2021 CA POST Guidelines for the Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation. This addition aims to provide clear guidance on conducting interviews that gather only essential information to avoid further trauma to the victim while ensuring compliance with best investigative practices.	3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	The following language regarding the "Minimal Facts Interview" was added to Draft DGO Section - Juvenile Victim Interviews: *"Minimal Facts Interview: When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted".*	Open
R48	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended adding "witnesses" to the list of individuals from whom the responding officer should gather as much information as possible before conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.	3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "*The responding officer shall obtain as much information as possible from the adult family member, social worker, hospital staff, or teacher regarding the assault prior to conducting minimal facts interview or questioning the child.* " Proposed New Language: *"the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child".*	Open

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
R49	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] -** A working group member recommended removing the phrase "by a stranger or known person" when referencing a joint response or investigation in this section.	3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previously Proposed Language: "*When a juvenile has been sexually abused or assaulted by a stranger or known person, a joint investigation….* " Proposed New Language: "*In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving…* "	Open
R50	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] -** The working group recommended the following changes to this section when referencing a joint response or investigation: 1. Consider moving this language to the forefront of the section to emphasize its importance. 2. Rewording the role of the "Children Advocacy Center" to clarify that, while it does not have investigative authority, it supports other investigative agencies like the Special Victims Unit (SVU) or Child Protective Services (CPS) during the investigation.	3	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The 'Juvenile Victim Interviews" section of draft DGO 6.16 was updated to read as follows: *"Juvenile Victims:* *a. In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving the SFPD SVU and CPS shall be conducted. Although the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) does not have investigative authority, it supports SVU and CPS during the investigation . Note that the investigative focus of the SVU may differ from that of the social worker.* *b. Due to the sensitive nature of these crimes, the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.* *c. If enough information about the nature of the crime and immediate actions is obtained from a reliable adult, members should avoid further questioning the child.* *d. **Minimal Facts Interview** : When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted.* *e. **Multi-Disciplinary Interview (MDI)** : In juvenile cases, an MDI is conducted later to gather information about abuse allegations. This interview supports fair decision-making in the justice and child protection systems, carried out by a trained, neutral professional using research-based techniques. Key partners include the Office of the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, SFPD, Department of Public Health, and Office of the City Attorney."*	Open
R51	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Suspect Interviews] -** A working group member recommended to add the language regarding that CPS is required to interview suspects in cases of juvenile sexual assault cases.	4	**12/10/24**	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	The Department will discuss this recommendation in the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2025.	Open
R52	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Suspects Interviews] -** The working group recommended updating the language in this section to reflect the current field practices for interviewing adult suspects during sexual assault investigations.	4	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The language for the "Adult Suspect Interviews" section of draft DGO 6.16 is updated to read as follows: *"Adult Suspects* *a. If probable cause exists to place an adult suspect under arrest, notify a SVU Investigator as soon as practical. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow the instructions and guidance provided by the SVU Investigator. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is NOT responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow all current Department policy and procedures and instructions of supervisor. Members shall ensure the Miranda Advisement is provided prior to conducting a suspect interview.* *b. If probable cause does not exist to place an adult suspect under arrest, patrol officers shall not attempt to interview the suspect as this may compromise the integrity of the investigation. Patrol officers shall notify an SVU Investigator as soon as practical. SVU Investigators will provide instructions and guidance to the reporting officers".*	Open
R53	**Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Juvenile Suspects Interviews]** - A member of the working group recommended updating the reference to DGO 7.01 in this section to match its updated name as publicly posted on the SFPD website	4	**12/10/24**	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "*DGO 7.01 Juvenile Policies and Procedures for Youth Non-Psychological Detention, Arrest, and Custody* " Proposed New Language: "*DGO 7.01 Policies and Procedures for Juvenile Detention, Arrest, and Custody* "	Open