

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



General Responses

Dan Kelly, M.D.
President
Board of Education
August 30, 2004

After receiving the Civil Grand Jury reports on the School District's programs in the Bayview Hunter Point and in the County Community Schools, I requested the Superintendent of Schools and her staff to review the Civil Grand Jury's findings and prepare the required responses. I greatly appreciated the Civil Grand Jury's interest in the education of the children of San Francisco and in particular in these two critical and important areas of our work.

Having reviewed the Civil Grand Jury reports and the staffs responses, I am confident that you and the Civil Grand Jury will be reassured about the integrity and quality of the District's services both in the County Community Schools and in the Bayview Hunter's Point programs. As the responses we are submitting indicate, the District shares and even anticipates many of the concerns expressed by the Civil Grand Jury and is taking steps to address those concerns. In other areas, however, the Civil Grand Jury's expressed concerns did not represent accurate portrayals of the District's efforts or the community's desires.

On the whole, the Civil Grand Jury has been a helpful exercise for us and the community in drawing attention to the importance that we place on the education of every child in San Francisco.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

The issues raised in the Civil Grand Jury Report are subject to active, ongoing federal court jurisdiction in the cases of *SFNAACP v. SFUSD* and *Ho v. SFUSD*. A Consent Decree was entered in the former case in 1983, and was amended as a result of settlements reached in the latter case in 1999 and most recently in 2001. The Consent Decree addresses a wide range of issues related to student assignment and educational equity. The District's current student assignment system is mandated by the Consent Decree, as amended in 2001, and can only be changed by agreement of the parties or by order of the Court. The case is under the active supervision of Judge William Alsup of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
October 25, 2004

The following is a follow-up report on the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report *The More Things Change, The More They Stay The Same: The City and County of San Francisco and The San Francisco Unified School District Are Failing to Address the Educational Needs of the Bayview Hunters Point Community*.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. The hearing was continued to the call of the Chair to be held at a time to allow for the attendance and participation of Supervisor Maxwell, parents and students.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
December 6, 2004

The following is a follow-up to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report *The More Things Change, The More They Stay The Same: The City and County of San Francisco and The San Francisco Unified School District Are Failing to Address the Educational Needs of the Bayview Hunters Point Community.*

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, December 2, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Representatives from the San Francisco Unified School District responded to all the recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury. Parents and members of the community were heard during public comment and the matter was filed at the conclusion of the hearing.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
June 29, 2005

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, December 2, 2004. Representatives from the SFUSD responded to all the recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury. Parents and members of the community were heard during public comment and the matter was filed at the conclusion of the hearing.

TERMS

SFUSD -San Francisco Unified School District

BVHP -Bayview Hunters Point

HP -Hunters Point

CGJ -Civil Grand Jury

Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses		Board of Education	SFUSD	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
1	SFUSD should provide the Bayview Hunters Point district with neighborhood schools commensurate to its population of eligible local students.	Students have right to select schools from any neighborhood within the District. (Disagree)		
2	SFUSD and the Redevelopment Agency should forge a plan to build additional schools in the Bayview Hunters Point region in order to address projected needs arising from development of new housing.	The SFUSD Master Facilities Plan projects excess capacity at the District.		Based on consultant data, SFUSD has not determined that additional schools will be required.
3	SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that eligible students get enrolled in Dream Schools and that students not eligible are given every opportunity to attend their current school next year with equal or improved resources.		Implemented	
4	SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that students who are eligible for free or low-cost lunches are receiving them.		Implemented	

For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.

CHAPTER 4

COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: POOR STEPCHILDREN OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

BACKGROUND

The 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury investigated the San Francisco Unified School District's (SFUSD) administration of the County Community Schools (CCS).¹⁰ The California Education Code mandates that all children, except those who are legally excused, between 6 and 18 attend school full time. When students' special needs are not met by District Schools within a county, it becomes the responsibility of the County Offices of Education to provide educational programs for them. Programs are offered for children with exceptional needs, homeless students, pregnant minors, and youths detained in homes and camps. They include County Community Schools, vocation programs, and Community Day Schools. The funding for San Francisco's County Community Schools is \$93 million.

San Francisco's County Community Schools have the same oversight as the SFUSD schools, though technically, they are separate systems. The Superintendent and School Board of SFUSD are also the administrators of the county schools. The Civil Grand Jury found the duality of jurisdiction can be confusing, especially in the sorting out of budgetary allotments. The Civil Grand Jury found it nearly impossible to determine exactly how the CCS funds are allotted and why there appears to be a significant discrepancy in the per student amounts apportioned for CCS students and the amounts actually used. The Civil Grand Jury also discovered that San Francisco County could apply for a more rigorous alternative, Community Day Schools, a state program that requires a longer school day, has more classes, gives vocational training, and offers more services.

RESULTS

The Civil Grand Jury made 14 recommendations and required responses from the following:

Superintendent of Schools
Board of Supervisors
Board of Education
Mayor

The table at the end of this chapter lists all the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury and summarizes department responses. The table only identifies those departments that specifically addressed a recommendation.

¹⁰ The terms and abbreviations used by the Civil Grand Jury appear at the end of the chapter.

Finding 1: The San Francisco Unified School District Does Not Provide Safe Learning Environments for all of the County Community Schools

Finding 1.1: When the Grand Jury arrived at 1950 Mission Street, the County Community Schools' Phoenix Campus, for its first interview, committee members were disconcerted by what they saw. The neighborhood, with a crime rate second only to San Francisco's Tenderloin, is disreputable. It is obvious to even the most unenlightened observer that drug use and prostitution are thriving here with impunity. In addition to an apparent lack of safety, the twelve outdated and obsolete brown bungalows, the asphalt schoolyard, and the one broken basketball backstop loon as an indication of the District's lack of interest in the CCS students' welfare. The school is surrounded by a very necessary chain-link fence, which promotes safety, but hardly a positive learning environment. It does not help that the school day ends at 1:30 PM, when "business" is brisk. A police officer told committee members that, at the local police station, this school has the nickname of "Heroin High."

Response to Finding

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

Agree that the Phoenix campus is located at 1950 Mission Street.

Finding 1.2: On another school visit, CGJ interviewers noted that one of the one-room county schools (Community Youth Center) is located on the second floor of a building that houses a strip joint on the first floor. While the school's access is on a different street, the area would be deemed unsuitable for a city public school, as it should also be for CCS. As in the case of the Phoenix campus, SFUSD again ignores one of its stated goals (<http://portal.sfusd.edu>): "Maintain school environments that are *safe, secure and attractive*." (Emphasis added.)

Response to Finding

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

Agree that the Community Youth Center is located at 1693 Polk Street.

Finding 1.3: One-room schools may soon become unfeasible-due to the change in the state's credentialing of new teachers.

Response to Finding

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

Agree.

Recommendation 1a: Study the Availability of Other Suitable School Sites to Relocate the Phoenix Campus

SFUSD owns properties that are not presently being used for city schools. The Board and Administration should study the availability of suitable sites for relocation of Phoenix.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis. Within the next six months, SFUSD will analyze whether there are other available and appropriate sites for Phoenix High School. However, it should be noted that SFUSD attempted to relocate Phoenix High School to a new location on Evans Street during the 2002-2003 school year, and the students and staff from the school vigorously opposed the move before the Board. Therefore, the Board opted to retain the school's location at 1950 Mission in recognition of the articulated wishes of Phoenix High School students and staff.

In addition to going through SFUSD's Program Placement Committee, any program or site change must comply with Board Resolution 46-8A10 ("Resolution to Increase Public Input in Program and School Placement"), which requires opportunities for community input into proposed site changes.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

In February 2005, the Director of County Community Schools re-evaluated whether an SFUSD facility located on Evans Street in San Francisco would be a suitable location to relocate Phoenix High School. The location was found to be unsuitable because the facility's classrooms are located around a machine shop that is operated by a Junior College during the school day. The noise generated from the machine shop would be distracting and would interfere with classroom instruction.

District staff also investigated whether it would be possible to relocate Phoenix High to one of the school sites that were closed during the school year to help address the District's budget deficit. One of the main criteria for school closures was the underutilization of the school site due to low enrollment numbers. In order to fully utilize facility space and to satisfy legal obligations to the District's charter schools under Proposition 39, these sites will house a combination of several District and/or charter schools. It is not feasible for Phoenix High to share space in this manner, because it would require the District to commingle students in comprehensive programs with students who have been expelled for a serious violation of District rules.¹¹

¹¹ In the context of Community Day Schools (which also serve students who have been expelled), the Education Code acknowledges the problem of commingling students in comprehensive schools with students who have been expelled. Cal. Educ. Code Section 48661(a).

Recommendation 1b: Relocate Immediately the Phoenix Campus

SFUSD should move immediately to relocate the CCS Phoenix School campus.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis, as described above.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

As noted above, the District determined that relocation of the Phoenix High School site is not currently feasible. However, the Director of County Community Schools has taken action to improve the physical quality of the facility located at 1950 Mission. The entire facility has been cleaned, reorganized and enhanced to increase the physical resources available to Phoenix High School students.

The facility has been updated to include a computer lab with an LCD screen that is used for classroom instruction, online courses (such as Drivers Education) and Cooperative Vocational Education. The site also has a new library, and a multipurpose room that houses health and wellness information, as well as information about community resources for students, parents and guardians. This room is also used to house a social worker that works directly with students and also refers them to outside community resources. The room is used to hold girls counseling groups, and will be used as a recreational area with a ping pong table and other games for students. The site also includes space that is used for parent group meetings.

The site includes offices for a secretary, counselors, and an office for a parent liaison assigned to county community schools. Two curriculum specialists will be hired for the 2005-2006 school year to support teachers in the county community schools, a Program Administrator to oversee English Language Learner programs in county schools, and an English Language Development teacher will be hired as well. As part of the reorganization, the Director distributed new textbooks that were located at this site to all county community schools, and created a textbook room to store extra copies of these resources.

The external areas of the facility have been improved to provide a tented eating and gathering area, a basketball court and a volleyball court, and flower boxes have been added around classrooms. During the summer of 2005, the entire outdoor area of the school will be re-surfaced. The Director has also worked with San Francisco Police Department Captain Goldberg to arrange for officers to closely patrol the areas surrounding the schools, and the school has posted prominent signs that warn of enhanced penalties for drug activity within a school zone.

Recommendation 1c: The New Phoenix Campus Should Be Ready by the 2004-2005 school year.

Ideally, a new Phoenix School campus would be ready for the 2004-2005 school year.

Responses

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis, as described above.

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005**

As noted above, the District determined that relocation of the Phoenix High School site is not currently feasible. The physical improvements made to the Phoenix High School site are described above.

Recommendation 1d: Relocate the Community Youth Center From Polk Street

A secondary priority is the relocation of the Community Youth Center's one- room school from its location on Polk Street, above a strip joint.

Responses

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation is in the process of implementation. CYC is currently in the process of negotiating a new lease for their site to be relocated to Van Ness and Sutter.

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005**

The Community Youth Center one-room school that was located on Polk Street has been closed, and in the 2004-2005 school year students were relocated to a new site.

Recommendation 1e: Prepare to Replace All One-Room Schools in the County System

The five-year plan should include preparations to replace all one-room schools in the county system.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation is currently in the process of implementation. The District agrees that single site classes should be eliminated and is in the process of evaluating those sites for relocation. In addition to taking steps to move CYC to a new location, the Potrero Hill Neighborhood Center school site has been moved to the Principal's Center Collaborative Campus.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

The District has closed all county community single room schools, and has consolidated these small schools into four main campuses that are able to provide more comprehensive support and resources. The single room schools that were closed include Community Youth Center, Potrero Hill Neighborhood Center, and Ella Hill Hutch. Under this new reorganization, each campus delivers comprehensive core curriculum with a strong academic focus. The four campuses are listed below:

- Phoenix Campus: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class, Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support, and a middle school component.
- Principal Center Collaborative: This collaboration between SFUSD and Juvenile Probation provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class, Resource Specialist, and English Language Learner support. The campus holds three programs including: Project Impact, Youth Treatment Education Court (education and youth substance abuse treatment), SF Girls and Boys Group Home (Bay High). The site also holds a new Youth Guidance Transition Center, which provides a transition program for students who are re-entering the District after being confined to the Youth Guidance Center for a short period of time.
- Community Scholars of Success: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support.
- Sunshine Campus: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class (Hilltop), Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support. This site houses the Real Alternatives High School and the Hilltop School (for pregnant minors).

The county programs have partnered with Pupil Services to develop an Intake Center located at the School of the Arts. This three week program offers assessment, counseling, school review, case management and enrollment options. This program was created to support appropriate academic placement, and to ease the student's return to school after being referred to Pupil Services due to habitual truancy or behavioral issues. Students obtain 5 credits for successful completion of the Intake program.

Next year, county teachers will receive more curricular support through the county's newly developed instructional reform model. The model's design has each site administrator assigned to a specific academic department. Each administrator, in conjunction with two new curriculum specialists, is responsible for conducting monthly meetings to align all county programs to standardized instruction. The curriculum will be mapped to core assessments that will be used to measure what students have learned, and to track teaching strategies employed by the teachers. All county teachers have obtained CLAD certification.

Finding 2: The San Francisco Unified School District Should Ensure That County Community Schools Per-Student Allotments Are Being Used for Intended Purposes

Finding 2.1: It was only after repeated requests to various administrators that this CGJ committee was able to obtain budget print outs for SFUSD. The committee found it almost impossible to sort out the columns of figures in order to determine sources of funding for city schools and funding for county schools. The committee was able to ascertain that the 2003/2004 funding for CCS is approximately \$93 million, and the budget for County Community Schools, not including court schools or locked facilities, is almost \$4.5 million, a discrepancy that is unexplained in documents or by administration. What is of additional interest is per-student allotments:

- In the city of San Francisco's secondary schools, per-student amounts range from a low of \$3976.68 at Lincoln High School to a high of \$6497.53 at Balboa High School.
- The per-student allotment *for* CCS should be approximately \$8,000, but CGJ members could only verify a per capita expenditure of approximately \$1250. (Figures derived from information submitted to CGJ by SFUSD's Chief Business Officer.)

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

Disagree. The revenue specifically generated for County / Community Schools totaled approximately \$3.7 million for school year 2003-2004. However, this amount is also supplemented by other funding sources that provide CCS with a total budget of \$7.1 million. CCS students that are on probation or are in the Youth Guidance Center are allocated approximately \$8,049 per average daily attendance (ADA). Pregnant minors are allocated approximately \$7,955 per ADA, and all other county youth are allocated \$4,761 per ADA.

Preliminary average daily attendance reports for these schools show an average attendance of 555 students per day. It is important to note that while as many as 1,200 students may be in County/ Community programs at some point in the year, the average daily attendance – on which revenue is based – is substantially lower due to the interim nature of many of the placements.

The total revenue for the County School Service Fund (CSSF) is approximately \$93 million. While County/ Community Schools are included in the CSSF, the bulk of the CSSF dollars are generated by and dedicated to special education programs.

The District does not have a uniform per-student allotment that is determined by school site. The District uses the Weighted Student Formula in order to allocate funds to each comprehensive

school. Pursuant to the Weighted Student Formula, there is a uniform base amount of funding that is allocated for each high school student. However, this amount is adjusted to address the special needs of each individual student at a particular school. For example, additional funding is added to the base amount if the student receives free and reduced lunch, participates in the Special Education program, or is bilingual. Therefore, students with special needs bring additional funding to their school so that the school can address those needs. Each student will bring the same amount of funding with them (based on special needs or absence thereof) regardless of which site they attend. (CCS does not utilize the Weighted Student Formula, but Lincoln and Balboa High School are allocated funds through WSF).

Finding 2.2: Although the Superintendent and the Board of Education members function separately for the city schools and for the county schools, it is not apparent that two separate budgets are maintained. Since the schools function independently and since funding sources are not the same, it would be reasonable to keep separate budgets to insure that each entity gets and uses all the money to which it is entitled.

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

Disagree. The District's financial accounting is maintained in accordance with the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) as required by California Education Code. As such, the District tracks all revenue, budgets, and expenditures by fund, resource, goal, function, object and organization code. In this structure, County funds are designated as Fund 05. Furthermore, County / Community Schools, Log Cabin, Woodside Learning Center, and the Hilltop Program have separate organization codes that allow for tracking of budgets and expenditures within each organization code.

Recommendation 2a: Make Budgets Available for Authorized Agencies

SFUSD should make its budget readily available for inspection by authorized agencies, in particular, the Civil Grand Jury.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

The Grand Jury Report acknowledges that the Civil Grand Jury has obtained budget print outs for SFUSD. With regard to other agencies, SFUSD will implement this recommendation through its compliance with the applicable provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005**

SFUSD continues to comply with the provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

Recommendation 2b: Present Clear Budget Information

Budget information should be presented clearly, if possible, with explanatory summaries.

Responses

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

SFUSD will implement this recommendation to the extent that it is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005**

SFUSD continues to comply with the provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

Recommendation 2c: Keep Separate Budgets for the Two School Systems

To insure the equitable distribution of funds and to avoid co-mingling of assets, two separate budgets should be kept for the separate school systems of city and county.

Responses

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation is unnecessary because the District current budget system separately tracks county community funds. The District's financial accounting is maintained in accordance with the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) as required by California Education Code. As such, the District tracks all revenue, budgets, and expenditures by fund, resource, goal, function, object and organization code. In this structure, County funds are designated as Fund 05. Furthermore, County / Community Schools, Log Cabin, Woodside Learning Center, and the Hilltop Program have separate organization codes that allow for tracking of budgets and expenditures within each organization code.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

As noted in the original response, this recommendation is unnecessary because the District current budget system separately tracks county community funds.

Finding 3: The San Francisco Unified School District Does Not Fulfill Its Promise of Excellence for All

Finding 3.1: In spite of its per capita allotment of approximately \$8,000, County Community Schools offer the minimum schooling and services required by California law- a 240-minute instructional day, minimum services, no libraries or librarians, no physical education or coaches, no music or art, no vocational training or community service--"bare bones" services.

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

Partially disagree. The County Community School (CCS) system was not intended to function as a comprehensive school system. Instead, students were intended to enter county community schools for a short period of time, and then return to the comprehensive school system.

Notwithstanding this fact, SFUSD began taking steps two years ago to improve the quality of county community education, and to make CCS more like the comprehensive school system.

In 2004-2005 all county community schools will provide at least 280 minutes of instruction each day. Additionally, SFUSD has added various services to the county school programs, including hiring a parent liaison, a county nurse, a social worker, a truancy officer, establishment of an intake center, and purchase of on-line courses. The four main county community sites will have libraries, and the District has also purchased new computers. SFUSD is working with the YMCA in order to obtain physical education support.

The District is also working with the California Department of Education and has assigned a full time special education content specialist to county community schools to provide professional development and intensive monitoring of all special education programs in our county community schools. The District has increased the Resource Specialist allocation to four .6 Full Time Employment (FTE) teachers as compared to two 1.0 FTE teachers last year.

The District purchased new texts for all county community programs including reading and math interventions, as well as the new middle school language arts adoption. Specific trainings and professional development were provided for all county community teachers for the use of these new academic programs.

The District is working collaboratively with the Juvenile Probation Department to expand Project Impact (a court school) by allocating a special education teacher and paraprofessional. The YTEC

program was also selected by the SFUSD Secondary Redesign Initiative to become a community day school in fall 2004. Finally, the District will open Get Out And Learn (GOAL), a new outdoor experiential county program, in fall 2004.

The District will be continuing this two year process of restructuring its county community schools. During this process, school locations, teacher allocations, and funding will be analyzed. The District is committed to providing excellent education to all public school students.

Finding 3.2: The County of San Francisco is eligible to apply to the California Department of Education to become part of the enriched Community Day Schools Program. By so doing, SFUSD would increase funding for county schools, upgrade the curriculum, acquire additional services, and keep at-risk students in the classroom for a full school day.

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

Recommendation 3a: Replace County Community Schools with Community Day Schools

Replace the minimum-service County Community Schools with the more challenging Community Day Schools.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

The Director of County Community Schools and three of the CCS site administrators attended a conference in Sacramento to learn more about Community Day Schools. In May 2005, the CCS Director and the four CCS administrators made a presentation to the SFUSD Board of Education Curriculum Committee regarding the programs and services provided by county community schools.

Among the topics discussed was the possibility of developing Community Day Schools in the District. Daniel Sackheim, the Community Day Schools consultant for the California Department of Education, made a presentation on this topic and distributed detailed information about the benefits and requirements associated with Community Day Schools.

CCS staff determined that developing Community Day Schools was not necessary, because the District has already taken action to provide many of the enhanced resources available through Community Day Schools. For example, the District has extended the instructional minutes provided in CCS, has provided a low pupil-teacher ratio, school counselors, individualized instruction, and specified services for youth on probation.

The District has also provided enhanced support and resources such as a social worker, parent liaison, and attendance liaison. Additionally, the District is planning to hire two curriculum specialists, a Program Administrator to oversee English Language Learner programs in county schools and an English Language Development teacher for the 2005-2006 school year. Finally, the District already receives enhanced per-student apportionments for students on probation, many of whom are in county community schools.

Recommendation 3b: Use All Available Funding to Upgrade to Community Day Schools

Use all available funding for county schools by upgrading and making the necessary commitment to Community Day Schools.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

See update to 3a, above.

Finding 4: The San Francisco Unified School District Needs to Provide Information on the Success of the County Community Schools

Finding 4.1: On its website, the School District has a section entitled, "About SFUSD." While it is not specifically addressing the County Community Schools, the clear implication is that the article addresses *all schools* under its jurisdiction. These are some points that are made:

- [San Francisco's comprehensive plan for improvement is] a commitment to providing an *excellent* education to all public school students.
- We have established *rigorous* academic standards indicating what all students are expected to know and be able to do.
- If we are to achieve our vision of an excellent education for all students, we must provide more intensive help to struggling schools and students.
- Additional funds are provided to schools for each English Language Learner, each Special Education student, and each student living in poverty. These students are recognized as having greater educational needs.
- Our comprehensive, five-year plan, Excellence for All, identifies several needed task forces to address important issues facing SFUSD, including high school and middle school reorganization. . . . [Emphasis added.]

Notwithstanding its good intentions, SFUSD has made no mention of its dual role as city *and* county administrations. A reasonable inference to be drawn is that this five-year plan applies only to the district's city schools and does not provide for excellence in the CCS.

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

Disagree. Excellence for All applies to all SFUSD schools, including both comprehensive and county community schools. County community schools utilize the same curriculum and are expected to meet the same academic standards as comprehensive schools. County community schools also receive additional intensive support such as reading and math interventions, truancy liaisons, parent liaisons, a nurse, and a social worker. Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, SFUSD teams will provide county community schools with instructional walkthroughs and feedback on their instructional programs. Finally, county community students receive the same additional funding that is provided for students who are English Language Learners, participants in Special Education, or who are low income students.

Finding 4.2: Civil Grand Jury members spoke to an assistant administrator of Phoenix. The person did not know that there is no information on the District's website about County Schools. S/he could not recommend any publications with information and said, "Call the district." S/he was even unaware of the handout CGJ members had received on which are listed the eighteen schools and their teachers and/or contacts.

Response to Finding

**Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004**

Unable to agree or disagree. This is a description of a conversation and not a factual finding.

Finding 4.3: Several telephone conferences were conducted with teachers and/or directors. Most were followed up with school tours by CGJ members. The results are as follows:

- A representative of RAP/Hilltop Campus and RAP High School, said that there are actually two separate schools—one for pregnant teenagers, designed to meet their special needs; and RAP High School for students who are suspended, expelled or have dropped out. The representative is very enthusiastic about the good job they are doing at RAP with 75-80 students yearly. Approximately 25% of the students graduate with a regular SFUSD diploma. The school day is 8:30 AM-2: 30 PM, and the campus is located in a safe neighborhood. The person encouraged the CGJ to "drop by for a visit" and gave the committee copies of handouts that are distributed to incoming students.
- A representative of Community Scholars of Success Campus has been a part of County Schools since their inception in 1988. This person said that the program began with 18-20 youths in a single location and has grown to over 1300 children at eighteen locations. 72 students are currently enrolled at Community Scholars of Success Campus, and 10-15 earn diplomas each year. Wrap-around services (mental health, social workers, medical care) are available on campus. The representative agreed with CGJ members' impression that the work of these dedicated teachers is pretty much ignored, and the achievements of graduating seniors are not celebrated.
- Community Youth Center has 19-20 students, from grades 6-12. Achievements are a source of pride—especially the graduation of 18 students in 2003. A teacher will be retiring in June of 2004, and worries about whom the District will find as a replacement. Before coming to CYC, the instructor taught at Phoenix High School for two frustrating years, hating the location and the drug trading and prostitution that were carried on openly in the area. This person found the students to be very distracted (and, in some cases, corrupted) by the environs. By comparison, the Chinatown location of CYC "is ideal." The interviewee would like to see the school better supplied, especially since probation students bring more money to the district than do students who are not part of the Juvenile Justice System.
- A Walden House Schools employee discussed the basic difference between locked facility schools and the other County Day Schools. Boys and girls attend separate schools. Almost all of the students have criminal records, and most have serious mental health problems. The school is frustrated in attempting to get appropriate IEPs (Individual Education Plans) for students; the District is dilatory and resistant. The representative described the situation of one student who

needed an IEP that would provide a resource specialist for him. It took nearly six months to get that IEP, and the resource specialist who was assigned is so burdened that she rarely makes an appearance. (Instead of 2 schools, she is assigned to 8). Nevertheless, teachers are proud of Walden's achievements; 12-13 seniors graduate every year. Four alumni are enrolled in college. CGJ members were warmly thanked for their interest in County Day Schools and members were assured that all CCS teachers and principals will be grateful for any light this committee can shine on their genuine needs and their unheralded achievements.

- At Ella Hutch Community Center, there are 30 students, grades 9-12, aged 15-18. Conditions are crowded, but the area is safer than Phoenix's, and CGJ visitors were told, "We got all new textbooks just this year." For the first time ever, County Day Schools will soon be getting a school nurse and a truancy officer—one of each to serve all eighteen schools. The interviewee said that students respond to a nurturing approach; for some, school is the only place where someone is kind or caring. Last year, six students earned SFUSD diplomas. Each year, there are good reports from alums who have gone on to colleges and vocational schools. They want to share their progress and achievements.
- A teacher at Bay High School for some time laments that there are no physical education classes, no drivers' education, no music or art classes. The school is really a group of schools, including Impact High School (a Juvenile Hall school) and a group of students from group homes. Teachers and students find the lack of resources enormously discouraging. The location of the school is safe and only a few blocks from the ocean. Even though a number of students have a 1 1/2 hour commute, they enjoy the safe and attractive location.
- At County Community Schools Middle School Academy the mood is enthusiastic and upbeat. Middle schoolers usually are there for the better part of a semester, then return to their former schools or are given a new placement. There was disappointment when district officials nixed an idea for a mural and some planting projects. One teacher said the biggest problem with the district is that they seem to regard the County Day Schools as *punitive*. The teacher believes it would be more correct to regard them as *therapeutic*. "These are not throw-away children." Many are disappointed that there is no vocational training for the students who do not want to go on to college but who aspire to learn a trade. It was suggested that training children how to fix and maintain bicycles could teach mechanical skills; at the same time children could be learning about protecting environmental resources.

Response to Finding

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

Unable to agree or disagree. These are various subjective descriptions of conversations held between grand jury members and unidentified individuals, and are not focused factual findings with which the District can agree or disagree.

Recommendation 4a: Add Information About County Community Schools to the School District's Website

Add comprehensive information about CCS to the SFUSD website and printed materials.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months. The District will consider creating a website for County Community schools that will contain more information about these schools.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

In January 2004, the District created an area on the SFUSD website that specifically provides information about county community schools, and this website was publicized on KALW FM radio 91.7, in the program entitled "Looking at Education." This website can be found at: http://portal.sfusd.edu/template/default.cfm?page=school_info.county.

Recommendation 4b: Develop a Five-Year Plan for County Schools and to Consider Upgrading to Community Day Schools

Devise a separate five-year plan for county schools-with special consideration to upgrading to Community Day Schools--and publicize it.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

The District will not create a separate educational plan for county community schools because Excellence for All applies to county community students.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

As noted in the original response, the District will not create a separate educational plan for county community schools because Excellence for All applies to county community students.

Recommendation 4c: Educate District Personnel About County Community Schools

Educate district personnel about County Community Schools and familiarize them with descriptive publications and websites.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

The District already provides opportunities for comprehensive and county community school educators to exchange information about their programs, as suggested by this recommendation. County community administrators meet twice a month with comprehensive school principals, and may exchange information about their programs in these meetings. Additionally, county community and comprehensive school assistant principals also meet regularly.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

As noted in the original response, the District already provides opportunities for comprehensive and county community school educators to exchange information about their programs. Teachers and staff now have the additional resource of the SFUSD website that includes new detailed information about county community schools.

Recommendation 4d: Celebrate the Dedication of Staff and Students in the County System

Celebrate the dedication and hard work of administrators, teachers and students in the county system. Give them the supplies they desperately need. "Nothing succeeds like success," but even the most dedicated laborers will burn out if their efforts are not recognized.

Responses

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
August 30, 2004

The District recognizes the achievements and success of all of its county community and comprehensive school teachers and administrators. These teachers and administrators are all recognized as District staff, and are not treated as separate from each other. All celebrations, meetings, parties, and learning institutes are attended by both county community and comprehensive school teachers and/or administrators. The District administration overseeing county community schools will ensure that county community schools have the resources and support that they need.

Arlene Ackerman
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
June 30, 2005

As noted in the original response, the District recognizes the achievements and success of all of its county community and comprehensive school teachers and administrators. These teachers and administrators are all recognized as District staff, and are not treated as separate from each other.

General Responses

**Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
August 30, 2004**

I am pleased to present my response to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury report on County Community Schools in the San Francisco Unified School District. This letter should underscore my continued commitment to work with the San Francisco Unified School District to provide the most productive learning environment for the students of County Community Schools.

In April 2004, I was proud to appoint Cedric Yap to be the Mayor's Advisor on Education. Mr. Yap has been integral in facilitating and maintaining a good relationship between the City and the School District. Mr. Yap will help the Mayor's Office work with the School District to conduct the necessary analysis of the Civil Grand Jury's recommendations and swiftly implement any change.

As Mayor, I am dedicated to providing an "excellence for all" education for every San Francisco student. In March 2004, I supported Proposition H, which will provide \$60 million for San Francisco schools. Additionally, this year the City has invested \$11 million in schools, which represents the largest City investment in years.

My focus has always been on those students most at risk. The Mayor's Office has been dedicated to creating an effective combination of city departments and community based agencies targeted at specific school sites. The City contracts with community based organizations to work with students who attend county schools.

For instance, Impact Community High School serves 25 county students who are involved in the juvenile justice system and have mental health needs. The City funds the Performing Arts Workshop to provide an arts curriculum that will keep students developing their talents at school. The Family Service Agency, another city-funded community based organization, provides mental health services to students and families as part of the extended school day.

Additionally, in conjunction with my workforce development initiative, part of the City's investment in the School District this year has been allocated to increase alternative career pathways for students who are not focused on higher education for various reasons. This effort should have a positive impact on a number of the students attending county community schools.

The Mayor's Office continues to seek out partnerships that make a real difference in the lives of young people, particularly those with special needs. I remain fully committed to supporting School District policies and procedures that will produce a more accountable and effective county schools system.

In conclusion, I offer my thanks to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury for their service to the City and County of San Francisco, and commend their commitment to improving the effectiveness of City government.

Dan Kelly, M.D.
President
Board of Education
August 30, 2004

After receiving the Civil Grand Jury reports on the School District's programs in the Bayview Hunter Point and in the County Community Schools, I requested the Superintendent of Schools and her staff to review the Civil Grand Jury's findings and prepare the required responses. I greatly appreciated the Civil Grand Jury's interest in the education of the children of San Francisco and in particular in these two critical and important areas of our work.

Having reviewed the Civil Grand Jury reports and the staffs responses, I am confident that you and the Civil Grand Jury will be reassured about the integrity and quality of the District's services both in the County Community Schools and in the Bayview Hunter's Point programs. As the responses we are submitting indicate, the District shares and even anticipates many of the concerns expressed by the Civil Grand Jury and is taking steps to address those concerns. In other areas, however, the Civil Grand Jury's expressed concerns did not represent accurate portrayals of the District's efforts or the community's desires.

On the whole, the Civil Grand Jury has been a helpful exercise for us and the community in drawing attention to the importance that we place on the education of every child in San Francisco.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
October 25, 2004

The following is a follow-up report on the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, County Community Schools: Poor Stepchildren of the San Francisco Unified School District.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. The San Francisco Unified School District representatives discussed new programs and changes implemented since July 2004, which include addition of information on County Community Schools on its web site and an intake center to evaluate students to properly place them in the right school. Public comment was heard and the matter was filed.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
June 29, 2005

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004. The San Francisco Unified School District representatives discussed new programs and changes implemented since July 2004, which include addition of information on County Community Schools on its web site and an intake center to evaluate students to properly place them in the right school. Public comment was heard and the matter was filed.

TERMS

SFUSD -San Francisco Unified School District

CCS -County Community Schools (County's current program)

CDS -Community Day Schools (proposed upgraded program for county schools)

CGJ- Civil Grand Jury

wrap-around services -Provided by community-based health and social service agencies to continue and/or enhance SFUSD's services.

Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses		Superintendent of Schools	Board of Education
1a	SFUSD owns properties that are not presently being used for city schools. The Board and Administration should study the availability of suitable sites for relocation of Phoenix.	Not Currently Feasible	
1b	SFUSD should move immediately to relocate the CCS Phoenix School campus.	Not Currently Feasible	
1c	Ideally, a new Phoenix School campus would be ready for the 2004- 2005 school year.	Not Currently Feasible	
1d	A secondary priority is the relocation of the Community Youth Center's one- room school from its location on Polk Street, above a strip joint.	Implemented	
1e	The five-year plan should include preparations to replace all one-room schools in the county system.	Implemented	
2a	SFUSD should make its budget readily available for inspection by authorized agencies, in particular, the Civil Grand Jury.	SFUSD will comply w/ CA Public Records Act	
2b	Budget information should be presented clearly, if possible, with explanatory summaries.	SFUSD will comply w/ CA Public Records Act	
2c	To insure the equitable distribution of funds and to avoid co-mingling of assets, two separate budgets should be kept for the separate school systems of city and county.	Disagree, Unnecessary	
3a	Replace the minimum-service County Community Schools with the more challenging Community Day Schools.	CCS staff determined that developing Community Day Schools was not necessary	
3b	Use all available funding for county schools by upgrading and making the necessary commitment to Community Day Schools.	CCS staff determined that developing Community Day Schools was not necessary	
4a	Add comprehensive information about CCS to the SFUSD website and printed materials.	Implemented	
4b	Devise a separate five-year plan for county schools-with special consideration to upgrading to Community Day Schools--and publicize it.	Disagree	
4c	Educate district personnel about County Community Schools and familiarize them with descriptive publications and websites.	District already provides opportunities for educators to exchange information about their programs.	
4d	Celebrate the dedication and hard work of administrators, teachers and students in the county system. Give them the supplies they desperately need. "Nothing succeeds like success," but even the most dedicated laborers will burn out if their efforts are not recognized.	District recognizes the achievements and success of its staff.	

For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.

CHAPTER 5

THE SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT GRIEVANCES: A SOLUTION

BACKGROUND

The 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury is charged with inspecting the county jails annually.¹² The Civil Grand Jury, during the course of the inspection, spoke with the Sheriff, inmates, deputies and supervisory staff. The inmates had numerous complaints about the facility, treatment by some deputies and the grievance procedure. They said the grievance procedure is not always followed and, as a result, sometimes does not resolve their complaints. As a result, the Civil Grand Jury focused on the grievance procedure, how it works (or does not) and what steps can be taken to improve it. Investigation included interviews with the San Francisco Sheriff, senior staff, deputies, the former ombudsman and inmates. Policies and grievance forms for both San Francisco and Alameda counties were reviewed.

RESULTS

The Civil Grand Jury made seven recommendations and required responses from the following:

Sheriff
Board of Supervisors

The table at the end of this chapter lists all the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury and summarizes department responses. The table only identifies those departments that specifically addressed a recommendation.

¹² The terms and abbreviations used by the Civil Grand Jury appear at the end of the chapter.

Finding 1: The Sheriff's Department Needs to Improve Its Inmate Grievance Process and Procedures

Finding 1.1: The Policy and Procedure manual in San Francisco is not uniformly followed. As a result, inmate issues may be overlooked or lost.

Finding 1.2: The Department does not have an automated system to track grievances.

Finding 1.3: The Department previously employed an ombudsman to handle grievances. This did not prove satisfactory for a number of reasons. For example, allegations of deputy abuse (either physical or psychological) should be handled by department hierarchy, because it has authority over uniformed staff. There was also the suspicion that internal politics made successful execution of the ombudsman's duties difficult and sometimes ineffectual.

Finding 1.4: Software is available to develop an automated program.

Finding 1.5: Grievances are kept in each jail facility rather than at a central location. Facility commanders are responsible for maintaining the records in their facilities.

Finding 1.6: There does not any designated individual responsible for tracking grievances throughout the numerous jails. An inmate or deputy can move to another facility without the staff in the new facility having knowledge of any prior complaints against them by an inmate or any alleged deputy misconduct.

Finding 1.7: The grievance form is overly complex, leaving insufficient space for the grievant to express concerns.

Recommendation 1a: Review and Amend Current Policy and Procedures Manual

The Department should review and amend, if needed, the current "Policy and Procedure" manual.

Response

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

The Sheriff's Department has reviewed and rewritten, where appropriate, the Policy and Procedures Manual regarding grievances, to reduce the possibility of prisoner issues being overlooked.

Recommendation 1b: Purchase or Develop Software to Automate the Grievance Procedure

The Department should purchase/develop software to automate the grievance procedure.

Response

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

The Sheriff's Department is in the process of implementing a new jail management system which will automate many aspects of jail operation. Where applicable within that system, it will be used to track grievances.

Recommendation 1c: Assign a Full-Time Employee to Track Grievances and Assign a Senior Officer to Oversee the Program

The Department should assign a full-time employee to input data. A senior officer should be assigned to oversee the program and provide periodic reports to designated senior staff.

Response

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

We disagree with the recommendation that one deputy be assigned full time to input grievances into a database because it is not a practical use of scarce resources. However, the Undersheriff does monitor grievances and provides periodic reports to the Sheriff and to appropriate department staff.

Recommendation 1d: Respond to Grievants Within 10 Days of Filing a Complaint

Every grievant should receive a written response to a complaint within ten (10) days of the date of filing.

Response

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

We disagree with this recommendation because it will lengthen response time to many easily resolved grievances. Therefore, we have no plan to implement it.

Recommendation 1e: Make Available Grievance Forms to Inmates

Grievance forms should be placed by the inmate in a locked box or other secure location.

Response

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

We disagree with this recommendation because there is no place in the jails where prisoners could access a locked grievance box. Further, in my view, the more interactive the process between prisoners and staff, the greater likelihood of grievances being resolved quickly and fairly. Therefore, we have no plan to implement it.

Recommendation 1f: Maintain a History of Grievances Against Each Deputy

A history of grievances against a deputy should be maintained and forwarded when the deputy moves to another facility.

Response

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

We disagree with this recommendation because it is violative of City procedures and state law regarding employee discipline.

Recommendation 1g: Simplify the Grievance Form

The grievance form should be simplified.

Response

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

This recommendation has been implemented.

General Responses

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
September 24, 2004

The following is a response to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, San Francisco Sheriff's Department Grievances: A Solution, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933 and Administrative Code Section 2.10.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, September 23, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Representatives from both the Civil Grand Jury and the Sheriff's Department were present at the hearing. The Sheriff's Department agreed with most of the findings and recommendations. The matter was continued until Thursday, October 21, 2004 to hear a progress report from the Sheriff's Department.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
October 26, 2004

The following is a progress report to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, San Francisco Sheriff's Department Grievances: A Solution, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933 and Administrative Code Section 2.10.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee continued the hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004 to hear a progress report from the Sheriff's Department. The Department reported it is modeling a policy similar to Alameda County in order to track grievances, responses and corrective action taken. It will modify the grievance form and procedures, which will simplify the process for both the inmates and staff. What remains unresolved is the accessibility of a locked box where inmates drop off grievances. The Department is exploring alternatives to provide inmates confidential submission of grievances and the assurance of directing grievances to the appropriate individual(s). Target date for the completion of a revised policy and procedure is December 31, 2004.

The Committee was satisfied with the progress report and the matter was filed.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
June 29, 2005

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee continued the hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004 to hear a progress report from the Sheriff's Department. The Department reported it is modeling a policy similar to Alameda County in order to track grievances, responses and corrective action taken. It will modify the grievance form and procedures, which will simplify the process for both the inmates and staff. What remains unresolved is the accessibility of a locked box where inmates drop off grievances. The Department is exploring alternatives to provide inmates confidential submission of grievances and the assurance of directing grievances to the

appropriate individual(s). Target date for the completion of a revised policy and procedure is December 31, 2004.

The Committee was satisfied with the progress report and the matter was filed.

TERMS

Grievance- a complaint made by an inmate against an employee of the Sheriffs Department.

Grievant- an inmate who makes a complaint.

Ombudsman -a person employed by an institution to investigate complaints against that institution.

Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses		Sheriff
1a	The Department should review and amend, if needed, the current "Policy and Procedure" manual.	Implemented
1b	The Department should purchase/develop software to automate the grievance procedure.	In Process
1c	The Department should assign a full-time employee to input data. A senior officer should be assigned to oversee the program and provide periodic reports to designated senior staff.	Disagree
1d	Every grievant should receive a written response to a complaint within ten (10) days of the date of filing.	Disagree
1e	Grievance forms should be placed by the inmate in a locked box or other secure location.	Disagree
1f	A history of grievances against a deputy should be maintained and forwarded when the deputy moves to another facility.	Disagree
1g	The grievance form should be simplified.	Implemented

For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 6 INCARCERATION AND BEYOND: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

BACKGROUND

The 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury investigated programs provided by the Sheriff's Department for individuals incarcerated in the county jails.¹³ These programs are: Roads to Recovery, SISTER Program, RSVP (Resolve to Stop the Violence Project) and the 5 Keys Charter School. The Sheriff's Department has kept statistics on recidivism rates for these programs. The Jury also investigated a number of community-based services designed to serve the homeless.

Roads to Recovery is an in-custody drug treatment program that includes acupuncture, academic classes, life skills, relapse prevention, 12-step groups, anger management, family issues, community planning and recovery process groups. The 2000 recidivism study indicates that 55% of the non-treatment control group recidivated; while 44.8% of program graduates relapsed. Significantly the recidivism rate for program graduates who were transitioned into residential programs was only 35.7%.

The SISTER program, the only one for women in the jails, collaborates with the Walden House Drug treatment program to provide a substance abuse course similar to Roads to Recovery. The recidivism rate for women inmates who completed the program was 40%, and 55% for the control group.

RSVP is the first violence prevention program of its kind in the nation. Participants are held accountable for their violence as well as for refocusing and restructuring their attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. A 2002 study of recidivism, subsequent to release, for this group found the following:

- 2 months or more in the program: a 42.4% reduction in re-arrest for violent crimes;
- 3 months or more: a 50.7% reduction
- 4 months or more: a 79.7% reduction (Attachment 3).

The Sheriff's Department received \$1,352,491 for these programs in 2003- 2004.

RESULTS

The Civil Grand Jury made six recommendations and required responses from the following:

Sheriff
Office of the Controller
Mayor
Board of Supervisors

The table at the end of this chapter lists all the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury and summarizes department responses. The table only identifies those departments that specifically addressed a recommendation.

¹³ The terms and abbreviations used by the Civil Grand Jury appear at the end of the chapter.

Finding 1: The Sheriff's Department's In-Custody Programs Are Beneficial to Inmates and the Programs Should be Retained

Finding 1.1: In-custody programs administered by the Sheriff's Department are beneficial to the inmates and should be retained. Inmates participating in these programs are low- risk, non-violent offenders, most of whom are incarcerated for alcohol and drug offenses.

Finding 1.2: The 5 Keys Charter School, although in operation for less than a year, holds great promise. Students enrolled in the school are enthusiastic about this program, respond well to the teachers and are eager to learn and achieve. They report a renewed sense of accomplishment and self-esteem.

Recommendation 1a: Fund In-Custody Programs at Current or Higher Levels

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors should fund in-custody programs at current or higher levels.

Responses

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
September 7, 2004

I agree with the importance of funding in-custody programs at appropriate levels, as best possible during this current difficult budget climate. I also believe in the importance of looking for measurable results from that funding.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

This recommendation is directed at the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors; however, I agree that in-custody programs should be funded at higher levels. In September 2004, we opened the Five Keys Charter High School in the jails, which allowed us to access state charter school funding for in-custody and post-release education programs.

Finding 2: Community-Based Programs Are Not Beneficial

Finding 2.1: The Sheriff's Department does not have the staff or budget to develop community-based programs to serve released individuals, nor is it their responsibility.

Finding 2.2: Programs in existence are frequently difficult to locate, confusing to access, limited in capacity and often inadequate to the needs of this population.

Recommendation 2a: Effective Programs Need to Be Formulated

The Mayor's office should determine the needs of individuals exiting the jails to assist in formulating effective programs

Responses

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
September 7, 2004

I am committed to finding innovative and effective ways to address the needs of persons released from custody, especially as it relates to preventing recidivism and homelessness. I am pleased to have assisted the Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) advance their project to improve data sharing among local law enforcement agencies, through my legislation that created the Governing Council to oversee JUSTIS. I look forward to the implementation of that program next year. I am also proud of the recent Innovations in Government award received by the Sheriff's Department from the Kennedy School of Government for their Resolve to Stop the Violence Program. I will look for opportunities to further improve coordination with the Departments of Public Health and Human Services to address mental and physical health issues faced by persons leaving custody.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

This recommendation is directed at the Mayor; however, I agree that it is beneficial to determine the needs of individuals exiting the jails. Prisoners who participate in our post-release programs, specifically Five Keys Charter High School and Resolve to Stop the Violence, are queried and referred to appropriate social services.

Recommendation 2b: Develop a Computer Program to Track Recidivism

Develop a computer program to track recidivism of individuals entering and exiting the county jail system.

Response

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

I agree with the recommendation that a computer system should be devised to track recidivism, however, I have concluded that until a national body, like the federal Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections, provides direction and standards, the considerable investment of time and information technology expertise required to produce such a program would not be justified by the limited local use of the results. It is hoped that the jail management system currently being implemented will provide some useful recidivism information.

Recommendation 2c: Prioritize Services for Individuals Released From Jail

Prioritize services needed by individuals released from the county jails when planning for the homeless.

Response

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005

I agree with this recommendation and support the Department of Public Health's discharge planning efforts aimed at the homeless jail population.

Finding 3: Community-Based Programs Can Reduce Homelessness

Finding 3.1: The cost to the taxpayers of San Francisco as a result of the negative effects of homelessness is great.

Finding 3.2: It is estimated that 40% -60% of the homeless are individuals who have been in the county jails at least once, and frequently numerous times.

Finding 3.3: Determining the needs of this population and addressing those needs can reduce the number of homeless people.

Finding 3.4: Providing permanent, safe and sober, clean housing is a priority for these individuals. Without an address and at least a message telephone, seeking and obtaining employment is nearly impossible.

Finding 3.5: The current shelter system is unreliable and inadequate. Roaming the streets during the day, hoping for a shelter bed each night, is discouraging and demoralizing.

Finding 3.6: There is no accurate data available to track people entering and exiting the jails. Identifying this population would allow proper planning for their needs.

Finding 3.7: These individuals need short-term assistance upon release from custody to help them navigate the "system". Only the most determined are able to persevere in finding programs suited to their needs.

Finding 3.8: Most inmates expressed a desire for assistance from a mentor/sponsor for a short period.

Finding 3.9: Existing agencies frequently provide similar or identical services, rather than specializing in one service. As a result, most programs are spread too thinly and can only provide limited assistance.

Finding 3.10: There does not appear to be significant oversight of agencies receiving public dollars. The quality of services varies greatly.

Recommendation 3a: Create a Mentor Program to Assist Recently Released Inmates

A mentor/sponsor program should be created to assist this population for a limited period after they return to the community from the jails.

Responses

**Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
September 7, 2004**

As recommended by the Grand Jury, I welcome a review of best practices and other research that could be provided on the efficacy of mentorship or sponsorship programs for persons returning the community after leaving custody. The 10-Year Plan for Ending Chronic Homeless, commissioned by my Administration and released on June 30, 2004, includes a lengthy segment on reducing homelessness among persons released from custody. The plan calls for creating more supportive housing services for formerly incarcerated homeless San Franciscans, as well as increased SSI advocacy.

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

I agree with the recommendation and would support and participate in a combined effort of the several City departments that deal with services to the homeless population. While the Sheriff's Department is currently funded to provide some mentoring services, such an effort specifically targeting homeless ex-offenders is not, to my knowledge, under discussion at this time.

Recommendation 3b: Audit Agencies Providing Services to the Homeless

An audit of all agencies currently charged with providing services to the homeless should be undertaken.

Responses

**Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Office of the Sheriff
July 28, 2005**

This recommendation is not directed at the Sheriff's Department.

**Ed Harrington
Controller
Office of the Controller
July 29, 2005**

The recommendation has been implemented in part. In May 2002, this office issued a comprehensive performance audit of the City's system for delivering services to the homeless and

recommended how the City can improve its system for planning, delivering, and evaluating homeless services in San Francisco. As part of the City Services Auditor Division's audit plan, we will be conducting audits of organizations that receive funds from the City to provide various services. Agencies providing services to the homeless will be included as those subject to audit. The recommendation will require further analysis to identify the number of agencies specifically providing homeless services and identifying the priority for conducting these specific audits.

General Responses

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
September 24, 2004

The following is a report on the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, San Francisco Sheriff's Department: Incarceration and Beyond, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933 and Administrative Code Section 2.10.

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee held a hearing on Wednesday, September 22, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Representatives from the Civil Grand Jury and the Sheriff's Department were present for the hearing. Per Jack McNulty, Civil Grand Jury Foreperson, a written response from the Sheriff's Department had not been received and requested to continue the matter. The hearing is continued until October 6, 2004.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
October 25, 2004

The following is a follow-up report on the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, San Francisco Sheriff's Department: Incarceration and Beyond.

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee continued the hearing on Wednesday, October 6, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Sheriff Mike Hennessey commended the Civil Grand Jury for its findings and recommendations. The Sheriff discussed the Five Keys Program High School for incarcerated juveniles, which is a Charter High School in county jails, and several of the programs that they have in jails that could be a resource after release. Sheriff Hennessey also pointed out due to budget reductions they are faced with a 15% reduction in jail programs. Public comment was heard and the matter was filed.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
June 29, 2005

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee held a hearing on Wednesday, September 22, 2004. Per Jack McNulty, Civil Grand Jury Foreperson, a written response from the Sheriff's Department had not been received and requested to continue the matter. The hearing was continued to October 6, 2004.

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee continued the hearing on Wednesday, October 6, 2004. Sheriff Mike Hennessey discussed the Five Keys Program High School for incarcerated juveniles, which is a Charter High School in county jails, and several of the programs that they have in jails that could be a resource after release. Sheriff Hennessey also pointed out due to budget reductions they are faced with a 15% reduction in jail programs. Public comment was heard and the matter was filed.

TERMS

Recidivism - habitual or chronic relapse, especially into crime or antisocial behavior

Misdemeanant - an individual found to have committed a misdemeanor

RSVP- Resolve to Stop the Violence Project

Roads to Recovery - an in-custody drug treatment for men

SISTER - an in-custody drug treatment for women

Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses		Sheriff	Mayor	Office of the Controller
1a	The Mayor and Board of Supervisors should find in-custody programs at current or higher levels.	Agree	Agree	
2a	The Mayor's office should determine the needs of individuals exiting the jails to assist in formulating effective programs	Agree	Agree	
2b	Develop a computer program to track recidivism of individuals entering and exiting the county jail system.	Agree		
2c	Prioritize services needed by individuals released from the county jails when planning for the homeless.	Agree		
3a	A mentor/sponsor program should be created to assist this population for a limited period after they return to the community from the jails.	Agree	Agree	
3b	An audit of all agencies currently charged with providing services to the homeless should be undertaken.	Not Directed by Sheriff		Implemented in Part.

For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 7

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES: PUTTING THE CHILDREN FIRST

BACKGROUND

Because of child support complaints from parents, custodial and non-custodial, the 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury investigated the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS).¹⁴ The Civil Grand Jury concluded that DCSS is such a successful and smooth-running operation that it has few suggestions for improvement. However, after touring another facility and after learning about the activities of other DCSS agencies in California, the Civil Grand Jury recommended some changes. The Civil Grand Jury's consensus is that providing even better accessibility would result in even better service to the city/county of San Francisco.

RESULTS

The Civil Grand Jury made nine recommendations and required responses from the following:

Board of Supervisors
Department of Child Support Services
Mayor

The table at the end of this chapter lists all the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury and summarizes department responses. The table only identifies those departments that specifically addressed a recommendation.

¹⁴ The terms and abbreviations used by the Civil Grand Jury appear at the end of the chapter.

Finding 1: The Department of Child Support Services Needs to Improve Its Communications About Its Role and Processes

Finding 1.1: There is confusion about whom DCSS represents and what is its role. There is a persistent misconception that DCSS and the Family Court represent the custodial parent. Though untrue, that notion encourages unintended adversarial relationship (or worse, escalates an already bad relationship) between the parents.

Finding 1.2: DCSS sometimes fails to explain completely the agency's systems and paperwork. It is possible that the client is unable to ask the question that would provide necessary information.

Finding 1.3: Although the agency has a wealth of informative literature describing what parents will encounter within the system, it isn't always readily available. Even when it is, some parents are just unwilling or unable to read it or to file it away for future reference

Finding 1.4: Several interviewed parents did not seem to understand the process even though they were in the middle of it.

Finding 1.5: With community assistance and in collaboration with local radio and television stations, Monterey County DCSS broadcasts informational 30-second advertisements in English and Spanish.

Finding 1.6: Contra Costa County has, with volunteer dollars and expertise, produced several videos that explain DCSS, the process of obtaining child support, and many ancillary services. These teaching videos are shown in translation when appropriate) on local television stations and at outreach gatherings.

General Responses to Findings

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Non-Custodial Parent Outreach

Although the majority of requests for the department's services come from custodial parents (CP) and not non-custodial parents (NP), it is a well-known misconception that the department is "custodial parent driven" and are only here to support the CP. The child support program at the federal, state and local level are working hard to reach out to NP's and change the minds about the program. Specifically, the child support program in San Francisco has initiated new procedures designed to improve customer service to NP's:

The NP no longer has to pay to file an Answer for Genetic Testing but may sign an Agreement in our office for free testing;

The NP no longer has to pay to file a Motion to Modify an Order; if the DCSS caseworker discovers the NP is in prison or on aid, the caseworker will automatically send a Stipulation modifying the order to the NP (without the need for the NP to file a Motion in court);

The NP may open a case against himself in order to begin paying child support;
We provide early notification to the NP advising him/her of our actions in order to eliminate the embarrassment of service of documents at the NP's home/place of business;

The state has implemented the Paternity Opportunity Program (POP) wherein the NP signs a form, which becomes a legal document that adjudicates parentage;

SF DCSS implemented the Non-Custodial Education and Training (NET) program designed to provide comprehensive with partnering programs to support NP's as they become job ready;

SF DCSS is partnering with the Family Law Facilitator to provide onsite assistance to our NPs with child support, visitation, and custody issues;

And finally SF DCSS continues to provide consistent outreach to all the communities of San Francisco as well as local correctional facilities in an effort to help increase understanding of the child support process through education and respond to NP concerns and frustrations with existing cases.

Radio and Television Advertisements

The department understands that pamphlets and handouts, though extremely important as a reference tool, should not be the only form of communication to our clients. San Francisco residents have a right to information through multi-media channels that takes into consideration language, culture, and dialect. The San Francisco Department of Child Support Services understands that and has implemented an aggressive plan to promote program information through multi-media sources. We are in our second year and well on our way. Here are some events coming up:

Television Infomercials

Thirty-second PSA infomercials carried on the following television stations: KPIX TV 5, UPN KBHK 44, Cable TV 12/Digital 8, KTSF TV 26, and ABC KGO TV 7, with a total viewers of over 5,000,000 in the Bay Area.

Video

San Francisco has, BETA & DVD, VHS tapes that cover in English & Spanish KTSF TV 26 taped one ½ hour forum show on child support services (Chinese)

Radio Shows

Spanish Question and Answers of child support services on AM/FM Radio, La Grande Radio Show, Monday to Fridays, from 2:00 to 4:00 pm
Chinese Radio FM 91.7 & Sing Tao Radio Am 1400, on child support services
Samoan Community Media collaboration is in the works

Collaborations in Printed Medias

Spanish magazine, Avance Magazine has a monthly child support article
Board of Supervisors Outreach Medias – (Afro-Am, Chinese, Spanish, Gay-lesbian) Asian Week, Bay Area Reporter, Chinese Press, Chinese Times, El Latino, El Mensajero, El Reportero, New Bayview News, and World Journal
Neighborhood News: Richmond Times, Sunset Beacon, Sun Reporter

Present and Future Collaborations

Muni Bus Stop Ad set for further review pending budget ability
 Posters, fliers, etc with libraries, churches, schools, community or city agencies
 Community based organizations - partnerships with many.

It should also be noted that an Internet Website will be available shortly for SFDCSS customers to access the latest information regarding their case status (e.g. billing/account information, latest payment, etc.)

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

The Department of Child Support Services (Department) respectfully submits its update on all recommendations described and delivered by the Civil Grand Jury as of July 7, 2004 in a report to the then Director Milton M. Hyams. The Department has taken all necessary and appropriate steps to implement the Civil Grand Jury recommendations based on the following findings and associated recommendations:

Findings	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6
Recommendations	1a	1b	1c			
Findings	2.1	2.2	2.3			
Recommendations	2a	2b				
Findings	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6
Recommendations	3a	3b	3c			

The Department has implemented new strategies in customer service to improve the participation of non-custodial parents (NCPs) in the child support program. The overall intent of the Enhanced Non-custodial Parent Involvement (EPIC) project has been to increase NCP participation in the support order establishment process. This program has specifically focused on the issues of notice to NCP's and the educational, cultural, and economic barriers that prevent or deter NCP's from participating in this process. In addition, the Department has expanded its collaboration with the San Francisco Unified Family Court and its Family Law Facilitator to assist in the employment of alternative measures that include increased outreach and client support that have encouraged low-income NCP's to actively participate in the process of establishing paternity and child support obligations.

1. The Department has developed new flyers, posters and scripts designed to inform and convince obligors to participate in their cases. These written materials use 7th grade English to foster better communication and have been translated into Spanish. Listed below are the written materials currently in use by the EPIC Project that were developed specifically for the NCP that is in 7th grade English or Spanish that is less formal and therefore less intimidating.

Flowchart

Clearly outlines the steps necessary to handle regular actions such as opening a case, paternity establishment, modifying an order, stipulation agreements, and closing a case.

“Come and Get It” Letter

The letter that is mailed to the NCP before service of process is attempted and is available in the Spanish language version.

Service Flyer

The flyer the EPIC staff is sending out with the Summons and Complaint and is available in the Spanish language version.

Status Conference Notice

This notice provides the NCP with another opportunity to participate in the establishment process, reminding the NCP of his right to genetic testing, and of the Department’s need for current financial information.

Post Default Letter

The Post-Default letter, which accompanies the copy of the Default Judgment mailed to the NCP.

The Department initiated proactive use of telephone outreach that promotes the early participation of NCPs in the establishment process. The NCP, from the privacy of their own home, are able to obtain important information about establishment procedures, the right to genetic testing, the guidelines used to calculate child support and the enforcement tools used by the Department for collection.

To establish the initial contact with the NCP staff also contacted various people such as the NCPs family members, the Custodial Party (CP) and the CPs attorneys e.g. Dependency Court appointed and private counsel. Telephone contact provides the NCP with clarification of all documents and identified the person calling as their specific contact throughout the process thereby establishing a relationship.

The EPIC collaborative partners (San Francisco Superior Court, Family Law Facilitator and SFDCSS) have agreed to schedule Child Support Default Status Conference Calendars on Tuesday afternoons. NCPs who have chosen not to contact the EPIC team to resolve the default because of anxiety or concerns are persuaded with written and personal contact to attend the Default Status Calendar session. EPIC Team staff will explain that the sessions are not binding and will reassure the NCP of an opportunity to participate in a more informative and less intimidating environment.

The project has proven very successful. Lessons learned will become new business practices for FY2006.

Recommendation 1a: Provide written materials explaining its in-take process.

Written materials (in translation when appropriate) to be presented and explained at in-take should include a flow chart outlining the process to be undertaken from start to finish. Specifics should describe all of the players in the process and their roles-especially including DCSS, their computer and phone systems, and all its divisions: in-take, DSOs, attorneys and the ombudsperson.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department plans to develop a flow chart that clearly outlines the steps necessary to handle regular actions such as opening a case, paternity establishment, modifying an order, stipulation agreements, and closing a case. The flow chart will be translated into Spanish and Cantonese for improved understanding. The Department has also increased its request of outreach materials for FY2005 solely provided by the California Department of Child Support. The department is required to use only state-approved materials for outreach and reprints state documents at its own expense.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department developed several flow charts that clearly outline the steps necessary to handle regular actions such as opening a case, paternity establishment, modifying an order, stipulation agreements, and closing a case. The flow charts will be translated into Spanish and Cantonese for improved understanding by the end of the August, 2005. The Department has also increased its request of outreach materials for FY2005 solely provided by the California Department of Child Support. The department is required to use only state-approved materials for outreach and reprints state documents at its own expense.

Recommendation 1b: Explain How the Family Court and Family Law Facilitator Can Be Used by Parents.

The role of the court and the Family Law Facilitator and how they can be accessed should be explained- especially if it appears that the parents will be unwilling or unable to stipulate a plan for child support.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department plans to collaborate with the Family Law Facilitator to develop a pamphlet to be distributed through all branch offices.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department is collaborating with the Family Law Facilitator through the Enhanced Parental Involvement Collaborative (EPIC) and has developed several

informational fliers which have been translated into Spanish and is distributed through all branch offices and the Family Court to non-custodial parents.

Recommendation 1c: Distribute Information to Community Agencies

Packet information should be reinforced by the use and distribution of posters, flyers and videos made available in libraries, churches, shops, hospitals and community agencies.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department plans to produce posters, flyers, and videos based on existing state-approved materials to be made available to libraries, hospitals, community residents and community agencies where appropriate.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department has produced plans to produce posters, flyers, and videos based on existing state-approved materials to be made available to libraries, hospitals, community residents and community agencies where appropriate.

Recommendation 1d: Produce Multilingual Educational Videos and Advertisements

SFDCSS should add to its long-range plan the production of multilingual educational videos and television and radio advertisements. By collaborating with other agencies and by accessing volunteer time, talent and dollars, DCSS can expand its services to clientele.

Finding 2: The Department of Child Support Services Does Not Prominently Display Printed Information

Finding 2.1: DCSS does not display leaflets prominently at in-take points and court offices.

Response to Finding

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Availability of Outreach Materials

The San Francisco Department of Child Support Services (SFDCSS) is required to use State produced and approved materials such the *START* Handbook only. State-produced materials have

been on back order. In the meantime, the department has sufficient resources to provide additional materials to clients through our branch offices, the Family Law Facilitator, and to our Child Support Officer stationed at the court for this very reason.

Finding 2.2: Some information (The *START Book*) is not always available to clients, the court, or the facilitator.

Finding 2.3: The presence of metal-detectors and armed deputies at the front door of the main DCSS facility give the agency a very uninviting and forbidding aspect.

Response to Findings

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Security at the Main Office

San Francisco is a highly diverse and compacted urban environment in comparison with Contra Costa. The socio-economic structure as well as the demographics varies in comparison. In addition, the Department's caseload has higher levels of domestic violence flagged cases than that of Contra Costa County. Many custodial parents fear retaliation from non-custodial parents when seeking services or visiting our offices. Staff concerns regarding safety have been raised in an effort to curtail possible issues from occurring the department provides security guard service with guards who mirror and are sensitive to the diversity of our clients. They act as the initial reception to the Department and are trained to be courteous, professional and supportive to all the Department visitors. The Department's use of the metal detectors is in line with security precautions taken by many City and County of San Francisco, as well as other State/Federal offices.

Recommendation 2a: Display Written Materials at All Offices

In an attractive and efficient manner. DCSS should set up, monitor and stock regularly display racks of written materials and handouts at all DCSS offices, law facilitators' offices and courtrooms.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department has purchased and installed display racks in its main office, BVHP office, and Mission Office to be regularly stocked by the in-take supervisor. The Department plans to provide handout material to the law facilitators' office and the court for distribution through their offices. The Department's legal supervisor will be responsible for the regular distribution and re-ordering current materials.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department has purchased and installed display racks in its main office, BVHP office, and Mission Office to be regularly stocked by the in-take supervisor. The Department plans to provide handout material to the law facilitators' office and the court for distribution through their offices. The Department's legal supervisor will be responsible for the regular distribution and re-ordering current materials.

Recommendation 2b: Improve the Appearance of Its Main Office

Re-arrange the main-office entry so that DCSS looks more like a sanctuary than a jail. {Pattern reception area after that of the Contra Costa County DCSS.}

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department has begun minor work through a work order with DPW to paint the lobby area install new magazine and pamphlet racks and purchased new furniture. In addition, the Department plans to renovate the children's play area to include educational books, games and toys.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department has completed minor work through a work order with DPW who painted the lobby area, installed new carpeting, and installed new magazine and pamphlet racks. The Department also purchased new furniture.

Finding 3: The Department of Child Support Services Should Improve Its Case Management Procedures

Finding 3.1: Although DCSS staff maintains that calls are handled personally and promptly, parents insist that this is not the case.

Finding 3.2: More than 50 calls made to DCSS by members of this committee on every day of the week and at various times of the day were not answered in person.

Response to Finding

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Fifty Calls Unanswered

In addition to twelve (12) CSO's assigned to phone calls every day for a caseload of 27,000, the Department has an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) System that handles overflow calls. If both CSO's assigned to phone duty that day are on the line, the system paths callers to an interactive menu that allows the caller to automatically access information such as latest payment, current billing status, office hours/location, etc. In addition, the caller is allowed to leave a voicemail message for the Team handling his/her case. It is the Department policy that voicemails left before 2:00 PM will be answered by close of business the same day. Voicemails left after 2:00 PM will be answered by noon of the next business day.

Of the 22 customer service complaints regarding lack of response or slow response:

- 3 complaints were regarding customers not receiving a response to their phone calls on the same day.
- 2 complaints were regarding a delay in the return of tax intercepts.
- 3 complaints were from customers from other counties complaining about lack of response or action from their own jurisdiction.
- 1 complaint was about the LCSA not promptly serving a Notice to Withhold on the employer upon receipt of the information.
- 2 complaints were from another county regarding their request for documentation not being promptly responded to.
- 1 complaint was from a custodial party that wanted LCSA to collect child support from an unemployed non-custodial parent.
- 2 complaints were about the time that it took to calendar cases to be heard in court
- 3 complaints were about the time that it took to process and receive a court order after the hearing was held
- 2 complaints were about the delay in billing the child support account after the reopening of the case.
- 1 complaint was about LCSA's slow response in crediting a payment to a customer's account. (This was ordered by another county's court during a custody hearing).
- 1 complaint was about the LCSA's slow in petitioning another state for child support.
- 1 complaint was about the LCSA's slow response to a customer's request in sending information to her EW.

CONCLUSION:

3 out of 22 complaints were related the LCSA not returning the customer's call on the same day. The response to the customer depended on a 3rd party contact.

Finding 3.3: Of 179 complaints filed with the ombudsperson in 2003, lack of response to phone calls or slow response numbered 22. A visit to Contra Costa and observation of their full-time phone team of 8 or more operators gave the CGJ insight into how an efficient phone system could work for SFDCSS.

Finding 3.4: Parents assume that DCSS and the court will handle their paperwork safely and with dispatch.

Finding 3.5: Members of this committee, sitting in on several procedures in the courtroom, observed that paper work was lost by DCSS or the court.

Finding 3.6: DCSS should make every effort to reconcile cross complaints by both parents and eliminate the need for a court appearance.

Recommendation 3a: Use a Full-Time Phone Team to Answer Calls

SFDCSS should plan for installation of a full-time phone team trained to deal with ordinary questions and problems of clients. CGJ recommends that it be patterned after that of the Contra Costa County DCSS. Otherwise, teams and the ombudsperson should make every effort to follow DCSS policy and answer phones in person as often as possible.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Disagree: The Department believes that does, in fact, have staff operating as a Phone Call Center. As stated in our overview presentation to the CGJ in November 2003, the Department has six (6) Operational Teams that handle a caseload of approximately 27,000 cases. On each business day, each Operational Team assigns two (2) Child Support Officers (CSO's) to answer phone calls from the public.

This means that on every business day, there is twelve (12) CSO's assigned to answer phones. This compares more favorably than the Phone Team that the CGJ viewed in Contra Costa County. According to the CGJ finding, the eight (8) people Phone Team in Contra Costa County answers all phone calls. It should be noted that Contra Costa County DCSS has a caseload of approximately 42,000 cases or 5,250 cases per operator. Department allocates twelve (12) CSO's to answer all phone calls for a caseload of approximately 27,000 cases or 2,250 cases per CSO.

On a daily basis, Department assigns twelve (12) fully trained and experienced CSO's to answer phones. It should be noted that some counties use clerical staff or lower classifications to answer phone calls. This results in information being forwarded to another staff person, usually an experienced CSO for follow-up action adding to delayed responses.

Department assigned to answer phone calls are fully trained and experienced CSO's who can handle the call when taken. There are no referrals to other staff or units for follow-up. Whoever answers the phone that day is assigned the task/problem presented by that phone call. This results in quicker and more efficient activity.

In the last Fiscal Year, Department staff logged in 61,234 phone calls. This translates to an average of 5,103 phone calls per month; an average of 306 calls per business day.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Partially Implemented: It is the intention of the California Department of Child Support Services to implement a statewide call-center beginning the fall of 2006. This system will have regionalized offices that provide initial customer call responses for all 58 counties. The counties have been advised by the state and are preparing integrate its current services into the new system.

In the meantime, the Department does have staff operating as a Phone Call Center. The Department currently has full time case workers responding to and resolving customer complaints and concerns every business day between the hours of 8:00am and 5:00pm. The Department has five (5) Operational Teams that handle a caseload of approximately 27,000 cases. On each business day, each Operational Team assigns two (2) Child Support Officers (CSO's) to answer phone calls from the public.

In the last Fiscal Year, Department staff logged in 61,234 phone calls. This translates to an average of 5,103 phone calls per month; an average of 306 calls per business day.

According to the CGJ finding, the eight (8) people Phone Team in Contra Costa County answers all phone calls for a caseload of approximately 42,000 cases. That means the San Francisco has more staff dedicated to phone support than Contra Costa and that the support provided is by professional Child Support Officers that can respond immediately to concerns and avoid unnecessary delays for our clients.

This means that on every business day, there are ten (10) CSO's assigned to answer phones. This compares more favorably than the Phone Team that the CGJ viewed in Contra Costa County.

It should be noted that Contra Costa County DCSS operates as the emergency response unit for the County. The funding required to develop and implement Contra Costa's call center was provided by the County directly and had an estimated cost of approximately \$1.0 million and includes hardware, software, plasma screens, staffing, etc.

The Department is working to develop a cost-effective version of the Contra Costa center by centralizing the existing staff and providing additional training to Child Support Officers' to improve their customer service performance.

It should be noted that some counties use clerical staff or lower classifications to answer phone calls. This results in information being forwarded to another staff person, usually an experienced CSO for follow-up action adding to delayed responses.

Recommendation 3b: Parents Keep Copies of all Paperwork and Back-up Its Information on Computers

CSOs and/or attorneys should advise parents to keep back-up copies of all paperwork and bring it with them to court. The committee recommends that DCSS arrange to store all back-up information on computer so that information will not be lost.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department has an existing regulation that requires Department staff to remind all parties to a case that they are advised to keep back-up copies of all relevant documents and bring them to court. On all cases that go to court hearing, the assigned Department attorney is responsible for maintaining a hardcopy litigation file folder that contains all the required documents/information. In addition, each party submits all documents required by the Court to the Court file.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department has an existing regulation that requires Department staff to remind all parties to a case that they are advised to keep back-up copies of all relevant documents and bring them to court. On all cases that go to court hearing, the assigned Department attorney is responsible for maintaining a hardcopy litigation file folder that contains all the required documents/information. In addition, each party submits all documents required by the Court to the Court file.

Recommendation 3c: Reconcile Cross-Complaints by Parents and Eliminate Costly Court Appearances

DCSS should make every effort to reconcile cross-complaints by both parents and eliminate the need for a costly court appearance. However, when the court procedure is necessary, each parent should be given formal and timely notice.

Responses

Karen M. Roye
Assistant Director
Department of Child Support Services
July 23, 2004

Agree: The Department recognizes the cost benefits of settling cases before and/or without going to court. This is stressed in our training and procedures. At every step in the process, the other party is offered the option of agreeing or stipulating to a settlement without going to court. However, it is not possible to settle all issues without going to court. For example, disputes between the parties as to actual income, actual childcare costs, actual hours of custody/visitation, etc. are issues that can only be decided by the Court.

It is the practice of our Court and our legal staff that prior to every court calendar session, CSO's assigned to assist our attorneys will meet with all appearing parties to review the issues and to see if any agreement or stipulation is possible before the matter is called before the Court. Any such settlements/agreements reduce the time and demand of the Court and our attorneys.

Karen M. Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
June 27, 2005

Agree/Implemented: The Department recognizes the cost benefits of settling cases before and/or without going to court. This is stressed in our training and procedures. At every step in the process, the other party is offered the option of agreeing or stipulating to a settlement without going to court. However, it is not possible to settle all issues without going to court. For example, disputes between the parties as to actual income, actual childcare costs, actual hours of custody/visitation, etc. are issues that can only be decided by the Court.

It is the practice of our Court and our legal staff that prior to every court calendar session, CSO's assigned to assist our attorneys will meet with all appearing parties to review the issues and to see if any agreement or stipulation is possible before the matter is called before the Court. Any such settlements/agreements reduce the time and demand of the Court and our attorneys.

In addition, the Department has implemented its Enhanced Parental Involvement Collaborative in order to increase participation of non-custodial parents (NCP) and reduce the number of default orders that adversely impact the NCP. This program includes higher levels of customer service and outreach, bilingual support, case management by specific case workers, and increased initiation of communication by caseworkers. The results have been better than anticipated with 95% participation by NCPs in the process of stipulations rather than default orders.

General Responses

**Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
September 7, 2004**

I am pleased to present my response to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury report on the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). This letter underscores my continued commitment to work with DCSS to facilitate and implement changes that will help the Department better serve the citizens of San Francisco.

I have carefully considered the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury, as well as the Department's response. The Department has demonstrated thoughtful analysis and a strong commitment to implement the necessary changes. Thus, it is with full confidence that I concur with the Department's response to the Civil Grand Jury report.

I submit the following responses to the specific Civil Grand Jury recommendations:

I. IN-TAKE PROCESS

I commend the steps that DCSS has already taken to help facilitate the in-take process for parents in need of free services, especially with regard to cultural sensitivity. In order to make the in-take process more transparent, DCSS has done the following:

- Begun to develop a flow chart, in multiple languages, that outlines the entire process,
- Increased the number of outreach materials,
- Produced posters, flyers and videos that will be available at libraries, hospitals, and community agencies,
- Initiated development of a website where customers can access case status,
- Collaborated with the Family Law Facilitator to develop a pamphlet to be distributed at all branch offices.

II. PRINTED INFORMATION

I commend the Department's efforts to quickly implement change in regards to the Civil Grand Jury recommendations on printed materials. The Department has done the following in order to provide a more accessible and welcoming office environment:

- Purchased and installed display racks for increased accessibility to printed information,
- Will provide printed material for the law facilitator's offices and courts,
- Begun work with Department of Public Works to renovate the office and create a more welcoming environment.

III. CASE MANAGEMENT

I am pleased that DCSS has taken a proactive response to the issue of back-up materials and reconciling cross-complaints by parents, thereby eliminating the need for costly court appearances. DCSS has made it clear that they advise parents on both issues, in order to best serve their customers.

In conclusion, I offer my thanks to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury for their service to the City and County of San Francisco, and applaud their commitment to improving the effectiveness of City government.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
September 24, 2004

The following is a response to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report, San Francisco Department of Child Support Services: Putting the Children First, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933 and Administrative Code Section 2.10.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, September 23, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Representatives from both the Civil Grand Jury and the Department of Child Support Services were present at the hearing. Child Support Services agreed to all but 1 of 9 recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury and may be willing to revisit this recommendation providing funding is available. Some of the recommendations have also been implemented. The City Services Committee has filed the matter.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on September 23, 2004. Child Support Services agreed to all but 1 of 9 recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury and may be willing to revisit this recommendation providing funding is available. Some of the recommendations have also been implemented. The City Services Committee has filed the matter.

Adele Destro
Assistant Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
June 29, 2005

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on September 23, 2004. Child Support Services agreed to all but 1 of 9 recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury and may be willing to revisit this recommendation providing funding is available. Some of the recommendations have also been implemented. The City Services Committee has filed the matter.

TERMS

DCSS -Department of Child Support Services (county, state, federal)

CGJ- Civil Grand Jury

CSO -Child Support Officer

CALWORKS -California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids

MEDICAID -Source of government funding for medical- and health-related services for people with limited income.

FOSTER CARE -Social Services Department's paid placement of a child with foster caregivers instead of with birth family.

WICSEC -Western Interstate Child Support Enforcement Council

SACSS -State Automated Child Support System

Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses		Department of Child Support Services
1a	Written materials (in translation when appropriate) to be presented and explained at in-take should include a flow chart outlining the process to be undertaken from start to finish. Specifics should describe all of the players in the process and their roles-especially including DCSS, their computer and phone systems, and all its divisions: in-take, DSOs, attorneys and the ombudsperson.	Agree/ Implemented
1b	The role of the court and the Family Law Facilitator and how they can be accessed should be explained-especially if it appears that the parents will be unwilling or unable to stipulate a plan for child support.	Agree/ Implemented
1c	Packet information should be reinforced by the use and distribution of posters, flyers and videos made available in libraries, churches, shops, hospitals and community agencies.	Agree/ Implemented
1d	SFDCSS should add to its long-range plan the production of multilingual educational videos and television and radio advertisements. By collaborating with other agencies and by accessing volunteer time, talent and dollars, DCSS can expand its services to clientele.	
2a	In an attractive and efficient manner. DCSS should set up, monitor and stock regularly display racks of written materials and handouts at all DCSS offices, law facilitators offices and courtrooms.	Agree/ Implemented
2b	Re-arrange the main-office entry so that DCSS looks more like a sanctuary than a jail. {Pattern reception area after that of the Contra Costa County DCSS.}	Agree/ Implemented
3a	SFDCSS should plan for installation of a full-time phone team trained to deal with ordinary questions and problems of clients. CGJ recommends that it be patterned after that of the Contra Costa County DCSS. Otherwise, teams and the ombudsperson should make every effort to follow DCSS policy and answer phones in person as often as possible.	Agree/ Partially Implemented
3b	CSOs and/or attorneys should advise parents to keep back-up copies of all paperwork and bring it with them to court. The committee recommends that DCSS arrange to store all back-up information on computer so that information will not be lost.	Agree/ Implemented
3c	DCSS should make every effort to reconcile cross-complaints by both parents and eliminate the need for a costly court appearance. However, when the court procedure is necessary, each parent should be given formal and timely notice.	Agree/ Implemented

For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.

CHAPTER 8 CONTINUITY REPORT

BACKGROUND

The 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury noted that each year the Civil Grand Jury selects various entities of city or county government that it chooses to investigate. Additionally, the Civil Grand Jury determines whether to pursue any issues raised or recommended by previous juries. The 2003-04 identified several issues for the 2004-05 to pursue.

THE STATE OF SAN FRANCISCO'S EMERGENCY PLANNING

The 2002-2003 Grand Jury was highly-critical of the state of emergency planning for San Francisco, and it recommended that the Office of Emergency Services address the inadequacy of its emergency resources in areas of communication and technology.

Additionally, it recommended that the City should improve its methods of budgeting for emergency response. The Jury report elicited a scathing rebuttal by the then Mayor Willie Brown, who denied that there were any deficiencies in the City's emergency planning and subsequently demanded that the Grand Jury be abolished. Despite the Mayor's public histrionics, the Jury stood by the integrity of its report.

On his first full day as Mayor, Gavin Newsom convened the San Francisco Disaster Council and directed municipal departments to update their preparedness plans for earthquakes, terrorist acts and other emergencies. He gave departments until the end of March to update their response plans and ordered the Department of Emergency Services to create a new citywide operations plan by the end of June. Within the same week, the Director of Emergency Services resigned. The position has since been filled.

Presently, the Office of Emergency Services is located in the northeast quadrant of San Francisco and operates from the Emergency Operations Center which handles 911 calls for police, fire and medical emergency dispatching. The Center is undergoing a transition which will civilianize practically all its staff. Additionally, there is an on-going review of its triage protocols which are used to assess incoming emergency calls and to dispatch first responders.

Because of the vital nature of both the Office of Emergency Services and the Emergency Operations Center, it is suggested that their activities be considered as a matter of interest for the 2004-2005 Grand Jury.

FIRE SAFETY IN LOCAL DETENTION FACILITIES

The Jury recommended that the San Francisco Police Department discontinue use of detention cells at Northern, Richmond and Ingleside district stations because the cells do not comply with state and local fire codes. However, detention cells in those stations continue to be used notwithstanding safety and fire deficiencies noted by the State Board of Corrections and the lack of clearance from the San Francisco Fire Department.

Each year since 1997, the Police Department has made requests for funds to bring the holding cells into compliance with state and local fire codes in its capital improvements budget. However, the City's Capital Improvement Assessment Committee and the Mayor's Budget Office have denied funding because refitting the stations to meet safety and fire standards was not considered high priority.

Since October 1997, the station commanders have been under orders to implement an alternate means of protection -a fire watch-in the cell area every 30 minutes to check on the safety of any prisoner incarcerated there. Inspectors from the San Francisco Fire Department's Fire Prevention and Inspection Division do not consider the fire watch to be a permanent or satisfactory remedy; it was allowed only as a temporary measure, in 1997, in anticipation of refitting the stations within a reasonable time. As a result, the inspection service will not issue a fire clearance pending correction of physical safety and fire deficiencies which have existed for seven years.

The 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury suggests that the 2004-2005 Civil Grand Jury consider whether funding is again allocated for the correction office and safety deficiencies at the three stations or whether the Police Department discontinues use of the facilities.

THE LACK OF COOPERATION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS

During its inquiry into how the San Francisco Police Department related with the OCC (Office of Civilian Complaints), the Jury noted a distinct and palpable lack of cooperation and coordination between the two entities. The disunity between the two departments has caused the dismissal of many meritorious citizen complaints which affected the due process of the citizens complaining and of the officers being investigated. Record keeping of complaints and investigative files were slipshod; necessary documents were not shared in a timely way, and the Police Commission omitted the necessary management oversight to keep the complaint investigative process operating effectively and efficiently. The Jury's report called attention to the obvious lack of cooperation between the Police Department and the OCC and offered several remedial recommendations to the two departments.

During the past few months, a number of remedies to the complaint investigative process have been implemented. New leadership, which bodes well, was instituted: a new head of the OCC was hired; a new police chief was appointed and a new Police Commission was sworn in. Additionally, an ordinance was enacted (Chapter 96 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) which codified responsibilities and duties of the Police Department, the Police Commission and the OCC in the timely handling and reporting by citizens of police misconduct. The ordinance requires that the status and disposition of sustained complaints be made public and that instruction on the OCC's processes and procedures for investigating citizen complaints be required for officers and police commissioners.

Because the new leadership has been in office for a short time, it is suggested that the 2004-2005 Civil Grand Jury, midway through their term of office, consider, as a matter of interest, how the revised process for handling citizen's complaints against police is working.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

In its inquiry into the management of the Department of Building Inspection, the Jury found that preferential treatment was being afforded to certain Department of Building Inspection (DBI) customers. It recommended quality control procedures in both the Plan Check and Inspection Services divisions. Additionally, it recommended that DBI comply with state law by determining the actual costs of providing services. Lastly, there is a need to improve management and leadership skills of those in DBI positions of responsibility. The report of the Jury's inquiry and its recommendations brought public condemnation of the Jury by certain members of the Department who demanded that the names of the persons who cooperated with the Jury be revealed. The Jury refused to identify the individuals interviewed, pursuant to California Penal Code Section 929, and it stood behind the allegations made in its report.

In March 2004, Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed Rudy Nothenberg, retired former Chief Administrative Officer of San Francisco, as an "unpaid advisor" to the Mayor. Nothenberg's charge was to investigate whether there is preferential treatment of certain DBI customers, as alleged in the Jury's report. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors has proposed an application-tracking process to reveal any evidence of favorable treatment by DBI employees.

Nothenberg estimated that the report of his inquiry would probably be concluded in three months and then presented to the Mayor. Since the inquiry was commissioned by the Mayor, the Mayor would determine its acceptance and manner of distribution. Nothenberg's conclusions would be a choice matter of interest for the 2004-2005 Grand Jury.

TRUANCY IN THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Even though State law specifies the content, manner of delivery and time at which truancy notices are given to the student and to the student's parent, District schools do not follow a uniform truancy notice procedure. The 2002-2003 Grand Jury concluded that promptly-sent notices would reduce the District's truancy rate. Since the School District is entitled to State reimbursement for every first and third truancy notice it sends, the District annually collects less State monies than it could.

According to the District's Pupil Services Department, a process will be implemented shortly to ensure that the District will mail its truancy notices on time and thereby reduce its truancy rate and promptly capture the State funding to which it is entitled. Since the 2003-2004 Grand Jury did not have the opportunity to view the truancy abatement process, it is suggested that the 2004-2005 Grand Jury consider it an area of interest

THE CONDUCT OF THE NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2002 ELECTIONS

Currently, the Department of Elections operates in and from six major facilities during an election period—a condition which can easily endanger the integrity of the election process. Therefore, the Grand Jury made a strong recommendation that the City consolidate all operations of the Department of Elections into one site. The recommendation received concurrence by management of the Department. However, to date, an appropriate site has not been located, nor have any City funds been set aside for such a consolidation.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX

MEMBERS OF THE 2003-2004 SAN FRANCISCO CIVIL GRAND JURY

John S. Calder

Robyn Chan

Michael Creedon

Dustin L. Daza

Clement D. DeAmicis

Debra J. Hitti

Carolyn Koster

Walter Krumm

Samuel Macy

Jack L. McNulty, Foreperson

Susan B. Miller

Melinda Mills

Mary Mullen

Harriet Ross

Eugene S. Salazar

Cornelia B. Sapiro, Secretary

Nancy K. Winchell

Peg Winston

This page intentionally left blank.

cc: Mayor
Board of Supervisors
Civil Grand Jury
Budget Analyst
Public Library