



Assessing the Needs of Human Trafficking Victims:

# An Evaluation of the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking

Noel Bridget Busch, PhD, LMSW, MPA  
Principal Investigator

Rowena Fong, EdD, MSW  
Co-Principal Investigator

Laurie Cook Heffron, LMSW  
Project Director

Monica Faulkner  
Doctoral Student

Neely Mahapatra  
Doctoral Student

School of Social Work  
Center for Social Work Research  
The University of Texas at Austin

August 2007

This Project was supported by Grant Number 2006-VT-BX-006 awarded to Refugee Services of Texas, Inc. by the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**Assessing the Needs of Human Trafficking Victims:  
An Evaluation of the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking**

Noël Bridget Busch, PhD, LMSW, MPA  
Principal Investigator

Rowena Fong, EdD, MSW  
Principal Investigator

Laurie Cook Heffron, LMSW  
Project Director

Monica Faulkner  
Doctoral Student

Neely Mahapatra  
Doctoral Student

School of Social Work  
Center for Social Work Research  
The University of Texas at Austin

August 2007

This project was supported by Grant Number 2006-VT-BX-K006 awarded to Refugee Services of Texas, Inc by the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	5
Executive Summary .....	7
Review of Literature .....	9
Methodology .....	14
Sample .....	14
Protection of Human Subjects.....	15
Data Collection Procedures .....	15
Instrumentation .....	16
Data Analysis Procedures .....	16
Challenges and Limitations to this Study .....	16
Findings .....	17
Part A .....	18
Part B .....	31
Part C .....	36
Part D .....	39
Discussion.....	40
Recommendations & Conclusion .....	42
References.....	45
Appendices .....	48
Appendix A.....	48
Appendix B.....	49
Appendix C.....	50
Appendix D.....	52
Appendix E.....	54
Appendix F .....	56



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team would like to express heartfelt gratitude to the following individuals and organizations for their support of this project:

- The U.S. Department of Justice Office for Victims of Crime and Refugee Services of Texas, Inc., for their financial support of this research project and their commitment to serving and improving services to victims and survivors of human trafficking.
- The Political Asylum Project of Austin and Refugee Services of Texas, Inc., who graciously gave of their time and energy to recruit victim and survivor research participants.
- Members of the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking and participating victims and survivors of human trafficking, who shared their experiences, stories, and valuable insights with generosity and courage.
- Sarah McCafferty, Neely Mahapatra, and Monica Faulkner, whose patience is appreciated for hours of interview transcriptions.
- Julie Liegel, who provided the creative cover design for this report.
- Emily Wade, who provided professional editing services.
- Caliber Associates, Inc., who provided a model for assessing the needs of victims and survivors of trafficking with their 2003 study funded by the National Institute of Justice (Clawson, Small, Go, & Myles)



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking (CTCAHT) was founded in the summer of 2003 in response to Austin's first case of human trafficking. The case involved three minors and alerted law enforcement and social service providers to the need for greater preparation in responding to future victims of trafficking. In 2004, World Relief received a grant from the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs and subcontracted with Refugee Services of Texas, Inc. (RST) to coordinate the coalition and to provide services for victims and survivors of human trafficking. The coalition is comprised of members representing law enforcement and social services from the local, state, and federal levels. In addition, Austin has an active law enforcement task force also funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance within the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

During the spring of 2006, RST received a direct grant from OVC that required RST to set aside funds specifically for evaluation. RST then hired a research team from the School of Social Work Center for Social Work Research at The University of Texas at Austin to conduct the following program evaluation of the services and coalition operation of CTCAHT. This study was conducted over a period of 18 months and sought to evaluate several components of the CTCAHT program: network and collaboration between service providers and law enforcement, identification of victims, adequacy of community services; and achievement of program objectives.

Office of Refugee Resettlement within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services provides funding for programs serve to "certified" victims of human trafficking. Certified victims are eligible for the services and benefits of any refugee being resettled in the U.S. and are eligible for T nonimmigrant status (T-Visa) and permanent residency. However, individuals are eligible for these comprehensive services only after they have been "certified." Human service organizations that were working with pre-certified individual "struggled to piece together the comprehensive services needed by victims with scarce resources" (Caliber, 2007). The grant awarded to RST by OVC was developed specifically to provide services to pre-certified individuals. "In response to the need for resources to provide services during this "pre-certification" phase, OVC with the U.S. Department of Justice developed an administered the "Services for Trafficking Victims Discretionary Grant Program—Comprehensive Services Sites." The program provides direct services, such as shelter, medical care, crisis counseling, legal assistance, and advocacy to assist victims during the critical phase of recovery" (Caliber, 2007, p. i).

For this project, 16 interviews and one focus group were conducted with social service providers, law enforcement professionals, and victims and survivors of human trafficking (n=19). Researchers gathered data using a semi-structured questionnaire that queried about barriers and success factors related to victims' services and coalition operations. Interviews were conducted in participants' homes, businesses, or offices and were audio-recorded. Participation in this study was completely voluntary and participants could end their interviews at any time. Specific steps were taken to ensure that all the participants' identities remained anonymous. Data were analyzed using a modification of the grounded theory method, an iterative process that identifies and codes broad themes in interview transcripts in order to reveal thematic relationships.

Data are organized into four sections based on the sources of data. Part A includes qualitative data gathered from interviews conducted with members of the coalition, both service providers and law enforcement officers. This section focuses on strengths of the coalition, barriers to



service provision, and training efforts. Part B represents data collected during interviews with victims and survivors of human trafficking, pertaining particularly to services used and needed by victims. Part C represents data collected by RST, in compliance with the OVC grant. This includes primarily output data: number and type of victim services; the coalition's collaborative partners; and training activities. Finally, part D consists of a client satisfaction survey requested by RST.

Findings of the study include data gathered from service providers, law enforcement, and victim participants, in addition to data compiled by RST. In section A, data gathered from service providers and law enforcement participants are presented, reflecting two broad finding areas: strengths of coalition-building and needs of victims and survivors. Participants identified six strengths of CTCAHT in meeting the needs of victims and survivors of human trafficking: 1) Consistency of membership and meetings; 2) Effective communication and trust-building among members; 3) Service coordination; 4) Members' motivation and commitment; 5) Policy support; and 6) Service/resource availability. Participants identified six challenges that CTCAHT faces in serving victims and survivors of human trafficking: 1) Need for standardized protocols; 2) Inadequate resources and available services; 3) Barriers within law enforcement procedures; 4) Victims'/survivors' fears and emotional needs; 5) Cultural competence barriers; and 6) Communication and information barriers. Data gathered by coalition members evaluating the coalition's training efforts are also presented. Participants offered comments on the strengths and challenges of coalition outreach education efforts and offered feedback for future training. In part B, findings gathered from participating victims and survivors of trafficking are presented on five themes: 1) Services provided; 2) Barriers & service needs; 3) Strengths of services; 4) Strengths of victims/survivors; and 5) Victims' goals for future in the U.S. Output data are presented in part C. These include primarily the number and type of victim services, the coalition's collaborative partners, and training activities. Finally, part D presents a survey designed to be used in the future by RST in order to evaluate client satisfaction with victim services.

In general, the findings from this study reflect the tremendous progress the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking has made, and continues to make, in building the coalition and in providing comprehensive services to victims and survivors of human trafficking. While data present further challenges faced by the coalition, CTCAHT's structure, communication, and use of resources should be considered a model for other coalitions striving to increase awareness about human trafficking and to provide essential victim services.

This project reinforces and expands what many in the field of human trafficking already understand about the struggles of this work, and findings should be used as a foundation for next steps. Continued research is vital to advance our understanding of effective processing of trafficking cases and appropriate service delivery for the victims of these crimes. In short, providing appropriate case management and legal remedies to victims and survivors of human trafficking merits continual assessment and modification of current practices. After all, the needs and assets of both the victims of this crime as well as those seeking to prevent it will continually change, and the landscape within which we view and combat trafficking will also be transformed.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While human trafficking is not a new phenomenon, it has garnered increased attention throughout the last few decades (Feingold, 2005). Media attention, federal legislation and prosecution of cases have made human trafficking a politically viable issue as the American public has discovered that slavery is still an industry in our country. While groups from across ideological spectrums have embraced policies to end human trafficking, there are still many unanswered questions about this persistent human rights problem. There is still debate about what human trafficking entails as well as its prevalence. There are also gaps in the research regarding the number of victims of human trafficking (Laczko, 2005). While scholars and policymakers continue to debate these issues, the reality is that communities are already grappling with how to work together to serve victims (Clawson et al., 2003).

### *Extent of problem*

There is little extensive research on the numbers of individuals trafficked. Most recently, the *Trafficking in Persons Report* by the U.S. Department of State cites 600,000 to 800,000 victims of international trafficking each year (2006). Of those trafficked internationally, 80 percent are female and 50 percent are children (U.S. Department of State, 2006). However, little is known about the numbers of individuals trafficked within their own countries. In the United States, the majority of trafficking victims come from Southeast Asia, Latin America and the Newly Independent States (Raymond, 2002). These victims are trafficked into sex industries, domestic servitude, agricultural labor and sweatshops (Richard, 1999; Konrad, 2002). The average age of a trafficking victim in the United States is 20 years old (Richard, 1999).

The lack of agreement on statistics of human trafficking is largely due to the scarcity of empirical studies of trafficking (Gozdziak and Collett, 2005). Literature on trafficking largely focuses on defining the problem of trafficking or calling for increased attention to the issue of trafficking. Researchers face methodological issues in conducting studies on trafficking victims largely because victims are considered a hidden population and therefore difficult to reach (Brennan, 2005; Tyldum and Brunovskis, 2005). As the discussion of trafficking progresses, a shift towards research on identifying and serving victims is necessary, as this information is glaringly absent from current literature.

### *Definitions of trafficking*

For the purposes of prosecuting trafficking cases in the United States, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 defines human trafficking as:

the recruitment, harboring, transporting, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, slavery or forced commercial sex acts. (TVPA, section 103(8))

The Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (2000) classifies human trafficking into categories; sexual trafficking and labor trafficking. TVPA (2000) defines sex trafficking as the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purposes of a commercial sex act where it is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 25). Types of sex trafficking may include “prostitution, pornography, stripping, live-sex shows, mail-order brides, military prostitution, and sex tourism” (Caliber Associates, 2007, p. 1).

The TVPA (2000) defines labor trafficking is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 25)

Like many other definitions of trafficking, focuses on the force and coercion that must be present for a situation to be classified as a human trafficking case. TVPA (2000) defines coercion as (a) threats of serious harm to or physical restraint against any person; (b) any scheme, plan or pattern intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm to or physical restraint against any person; or (c) the abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 25). This is broad and allows for many different situations to qualify as coercion (Chacon, 2006).

Coercion and exploitation are generally agreed upon as the basics of what comprises human trafficking. Advocates also acknowledge that human trafficking is an industry that models the organizational structure of large businesses (Salt and Stein, 1997). As such, the phenomenon of trafficking can be viewed as simple supply and demand economics. The supply is men, women and children who are trafficked. The demand involves a network of traffickers who deliver victims to those engaged in illegal sex trades and those who exploit trafficking victims for labor (Getu, 2006).

#### *Smuggling vs. trafficking*

Despite the general agreement around broad definitions and ideas about trafficking, there are still some sticking points amongst advocates working on trafficking issues. For example, there is still an unclear line for some between illegal immigration, smuggling and trafficking (Albanese et al., 2004; Omelaniuk, 2005). Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (2005) defines smuggling as "the facilitation, transportation, attempted transportation or illegal entry of a person(s) across an international border, in violation of one or more countries laws, either clandestinely or through deception, such as the use of fraudulent documents (Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, [HSTC@State.gov](mailto:HSTC@State.gov)). Smuggling is generally defined as illegal transport of an individual into a country (Albanese et al., 2004). Smuggling has similarities to trafficking in that both smuggling and trafficking re-direct benefits of migration away from the individual to illicit businesses (Omelaniuk, 2005). The main difference between smuggling and trafficking is the lack of coercion in smuggling. Moreover, victims of human trafficking are considered victims of a federal crime, where as individuals who are smuggled into the U.S. are considered criminals and are subject to deportation. However, it is well recognized that smuggling often involves deceit on the part of the smuggler and that people smuggled across borders are vulnerable to victimization. Smuggling is also often a short term venture while exploitation through trafficking continues once a victim is in another country (Albanese et al., 2004). Often individuals are willingly smuggled into the U.S. but later become trafficking victims through forced labor or commercial sexual exploitation. Because of the grey area between smuggling and trafficking, laws may fail to identify trafficking victims because their movement into an area was not physically forced (U.S. Department of State, 2006).

#### *Prostitution and sexual exploitation vs. human trafficking*

For others, there is an unclear line between prostitution and human trafficking. Advocates who take an abolitionist stance argue that all prostitution is coerced on some level and all prostitutes should be considered sex slaves (McKelvey, 2004). While many believe that prostitution involves sexual exploitation, strong opposition to the abolitionist point of view comes from those who strictly apply the TVPA definition of trafficking which indicates that except for child victims involved in commercial sex acts, specific evidence of force, fraud, or coercion must exist in

order to determine that an adult is a victim of sex trafficking. Opposition to the abolitionist perspective also comes from feminists who advocate for the rights of sex trade workers (Soderlund, 2005)

### *Reasons humans are trafficked*

Given that the definition of trafficking is broad, there are many forms of exploitation that are considered trafficking. Two general categories of trafficking are sex trafficking and labor trafficking. Women and children trafficked into sex industries are forced into activities such as prostitution and pornography. The foundation of the sex trafficking trade is female victims and male perpetrators, and the gender roles of victims and perpetrators merit gender-focused strategies to combat sex trafficking (Hughes, 2000; Banzon, 2005).

While sex trafficking receives a great deal of attention, trafficking for labor purposes is actually in greater demand (Feingold, 2005). Victims of trafficking for labor may be forced into domestic servitude or industrial labor. One crucial component in labor trafficking is migration. Industries that demand cheap labor, such as agriculture, fisheries, manufacturing and construction, encourage migration of unskilled workers. In the absence of standards to protect their human rights, migrants become particularly vulnerable to exploitation (Richards, 2004)

### *Legal Protections for Victims of Trafficking*

The attention paid to trafficking in the 1990s led to legislation to protect victims and increase prosecution. The two landmark acts pertaining to human trafficking in this country are the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) signed by President Clinton in 2000 and the Trafficking Victims Protection Re-authorizing Act of 2003. Both acts have set domestic and international standards for various aspects of human trafficking including prevention, prosecution of traffickers and, most important, protection of victims.

Prior to the TVPA, victims of trafficking did not often self identify as victims of trafficking because they risked deportation. The TVPA recognized persons who are trafficked as victims of crime and entitles them to benefits, services and protection from deportation. Persons identified as victims of severe forms of trafficking may be eligible for temporary immigration status and services to the same extent as federal crime victims. Critics of the TVPA claim that it has fallen short of breaking down the legal barriers that victims of trafficking face. Other critics attack the TVPA for failing to address the structures in the United States that create the demand for migration and trafficking (Chacon, 2006).

### *Services for victims of trafficking*

While scholarly debate continues regarding every aspect of trafficking, little attention has been paid to the services needed by victims. Much of the information regarding victim's' needs has been gathered from service providers rather than the victims. A Needs Assessment conducted by Clawson et al. (2003) remains the leading source of information regarding the needs of victims. In the assessment, they found that providers reported a multitude of services needed by victims, the greatest of which include housing, medical services, advocacy, legal representation, transportation, outreach, food and mental health services. The largest barrier to serving victims is the accessibility. Victims do not access services for many reasons such as fear of retaliation by traffickers, lack of knowledge about services, fear of deportation, cultural and language barriers, and lack of trust in those providing assistance. Providers also reported that lack of resources, funding and training constituted a major barrier to effectively serving victims of trafficking.

### *Non-governmental providers*

Two main types of non-governmental organizations provide services to victims of trafficking: social service providers who provide direct services to victims; and advocacy groups that are involved indirectly with the victims. The advocacy groups interact with government agencies, the legislatures and other political entities to promote awareness and advocate for the needs of victims (Perkins, 2005). Direct service providers may include legal, health, education, police department/law enforcement, immigration, refugee resettlement agencies, prostitution recovery services, sexual assault services, domestic violence services, trafficking, child-focused services, and faith-based services.

### *Service delivery*

Because the needs of trafficking victims are often very extensive, few agencies exist whose sole mission is to serve victims of trafficking, and so the service needs of victims are met by a variety of agencies (Clawson et al., 2003). Often these agencies primarily serve clients with similarities to victims of trafficking, including domestic violence victims, immigrants and refugees and victims of sexual exploitation (Clawson et al. 2003). Clawson et al (2003) report, for instance, that immigration and refugee agencies provide a majority of the services to the victims of trafficking. Many agencies have had to adapt their service delivery systems to serve victims of trafficking. Fewer than one-third of service providers included in the needs assessment study conducted by Clawson et al. (2003) had some sort of formal procedure or a protocol to assist the victims. Other providers relied on informal protocols by dealing with victims on a case-by-case basis, or they adapted existing protocols used with other client populations such as domestic violence victims, refugees, and others. This finding indicates that service providers are grappling with how to integrate services for victims of trafficking into their existent service delivery models. Children have proven to be a particularly difficult population to identify and serve and further research is necessary to explore how best to identify and serve child victims (Bhaba, 2004; Bump et al., 2005).

### *Collaboration through coalitions*

With so few agencies devoted exclusively to serving victims of trafficking, the most common service delivery system is collaborations between agencies. These collaborations frequently include domestic violence providers, attorneys, victim assistance providers, health services providers, social workers, local law enforcement, and federal law enforcement (Clawson et al., 2003). Collaborations provide a means of referring individuals for services and an important interface for law enforcement and service providers (The Florida State University Center for the Advancement of Human Rights, 2003).

Current collaborations have resulted in the formation of more formal structures, such as coalitions against human trafficking, which exist on state and local levels across the country. Coalitions provide a wide range of services to victims of trafficking, including a safe environment; empowerment of victims, public education; awareness raising, dialogues with local and state governmental entities to formulate policies to combat trafficking, national training programs, conferences to exchange information, knowledge and technology on the issue, and other specific projects (Coalition of Catholic Organizations Against Human Trafficking, 2006). Despite their increasing numbers, no information exists about the effectiveness of these coalitions. Because coalitions are the most widely used form of collaboration for serving victims of trafficking, more information is needed to identify best practices and measure the effectiveness of coalitions.

Evaluation of coalitions is important for several reasons. First and foremost, many coalitions are dependent on funding streams that require evaluation for continuation of funding. Evaluation of coalitions can also ensure that members of the coalition share information and agree on the direction of the coalition. Evaluation can also help determine whether the coalition has set goals for addressing human trafficking and whether it has been successful in meeting those goals through collaborative efforts. It will also determine whether joint efforts have been more effective in reducing the incidence of human trafficking, providing appropriate resources to the victims, prosecuting offenders, increasing awareness in the community and empowering trafficking victims.

## METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking (CTCAHT) program administered by Refugee Services of Texas, Inc. (RST). Project staff developed measures to evaluate several components of the CTCAHT program: 1) network and collaboration between service providers and law enforcement, 2) identification of victims, 3) adequacy of community services, and 4) the achievement of program objectives. The study addressed the following three research questions:

1. What are the strengths of the project? How are agencies working together collaboratively?
2. What are the barriers to services for victims of human trafficking?
3. What training is available to agency staff serving victims of human trafficking? How effective is this training?

### Sample

Three groups participated in this study: 1) service providers; 2) law enforcement personnel; and 3) victims/survivors of human trafficking. Table 1 provides data on the participants by group. Study participants were recruited using purposive and snowball methods. Using purposive sampling, researchers selected participants based on certain criteria, such as their field of work in relation to human trafficking. Snowball sampling is a procedure in which current participants were asked if they knew anyone who might be willing to be interviewed and who met the criteria. A majority of participants were residents of the Central Texas area. A majority of study participants were interviewed individually.

Table 1. Interviews by Participant Category

Category	Number of Individual Participants
Service Providers	10
Law Enforcement	4
Victims/Survivors of Human Trafficking	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

### *Service Provider Participants*

Service provider participants were selected based on membership in CTCAHT and/or participation in the service provision to victims/survivors of human trafficking. Coalition members were made aware of the study and were invited to participate during several monthly coalition meetings. In addition, RST assisted the research team in identifying and recruiting potential participants. Other participants were identified directly by research staff.

Ten service providers participated in this study, representing the following human services fields: legal, medical, sexual assault, domestic violence, counseling, and housing services. In addition, one participant represented a statewide governmental agency addressing human trafficking. All social services participants were female.

### *Law Enforcement Providers*

Law enforcement participants were selected based on criteria similar to that of service providers. Participants with active membership in the coalition and with experience working trafficking cases in Central Texas and other parts of the country were identified for participation. Coalition members were made aware of the study and were invited to participate during several monthly coalition meetings. In addition, RST assisted the research team in identifying and recruiting potential participants.

Four law enforcement professionals participated in this study. Two federal law enforcement agencies were represented by two victim services specialists. A major local law enforcement agency was also represented by two participants – one detective and a victim services specialist. Representatives of these law enforcement agencies included 2 female participants and 2 male participants.

### *Victim/Survivor Participants*

Victims and survivors of human trafficking participated in the study in order to provide insight into the adequacy of services available to victims/survivors in Central Texas. All victim/survivor participants (n=5) were female adults age 18 years and older who were trafficked to the United States. Other demographic information, such as age, gender, language, country of origin, or type of trafficking case was not collected in order to protect the confidentiality and identity of participants. Victim/survivor participants were compensated for their time and expertise with a \$30.00 grocery gift certificate.

Throughout this report, victims and survivors of human trafficking may be referred to simply as 'victims' for narrative efficiency and in recognition of their crime victimization. However, it should be noted that during the time of receiving services, all victims of human trafficking have survived a horrifying combination of physical and emotional abuse, trauma, and financial distress. The term victim is not meant to be demeaning or judgmental.

### Protection of Human Subjects

This study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at The University of Texas at Austin. Written informed consent was obtained for this study with the service provider and law enforcement participants. However, written consent was waived for this study with the victim and survivor participants due to the vulnerability of the population. No signatures were collected; however, verbal consent was obtained from all victim/survivor participants, in English or in Spanish, by the interviewer. Clients were not asked any personally-identifying information, and the interview protocol did not include questions about their trafficking history. Participation in this study was completely voluntary.

The research team did not directly recruit victim/survivor participants. Rather, the RST case manager first approached them about participation. The IRB believed this to be a safer way to protect participants' right to decline. Participants were given the name and contact information of the research team and the IRB in case they had any concerns about this study.

### Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected from participants by interview. Interviews were conducted either in participants' offices, homes, or other public location, depending on preference of the participant. Twelve interviews and one focus group were conducted in English; the remaining four interviews were conducted in Spanish by bilingual research staff. The majority of interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. When participants declined audiotaping or in the event that



audiotaping was not possible, researchers took detailed handwritten notes. Audiotapes were destroyed after transcriptions were completed.

### Instrumentation

Two instruments were designed for this study. A semi-structured questionnaire with 18 opened-ended questions was developed for coalition member interviews (See Appendix A). A semi-structured questionnaire with 10 opened-ended questions was developed for victims/survivors of human trafficking (See Appendix B). RST's standard trafficking population report was also used in presenting output data (See Appendix C).

### Data Analysis Procedures

Data were analyzed using a modified grounded theory method (Charmaz, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 1998). This is an iterative process in which interview transcripts were read and reread by members of the research team prior to coding. Each transcript was analyzed using line-by-line coding. Codes were grouped into themes. Themes specific to conditions and challenges to service provision in human trafficking cases were identified within and across transcripts. The research team collectively confirmed the results by reviewing them against the associated quotes from the transcripts.

### Challenges and Limitations to this Study

This study utilized a non-probability convenience sample, and therefore the findings are not generalizable to other coalitions or groups of trafficking victims or survivors. Furthermore, the participant sample lacks participation by state or federal prosecutors of human trafficking cases.

In previous studies involving immigrant populations, the IRB-approved consent form has served as an explicit barrier for some potential participants who were uncomfortable signing a document that appeared to be legal in nature, despite an explanation of its purpose and intended use. The waiver of written consent by victims and survivors of human trafficking by the IRB in this study represents a model for future research in the area of human trafficking. Research staff encountered few difficulties with recruitment due to the many other safeguards in place to protect the identities of participants.

## FINDINGS

Data are organized into three sections, based on the sources of data. Part A includes qualitative data gathered from the interviews conducted with members of the coalition, both service providers and law enforcement officers. This section focuses on strengths of the coalition, barriers to service provision, and training efforts. Part B represents data collected during interviews with victims and survivors of human trafficking, pertaining particularly to services used and needed by victims. Part C represents data collected by RST, in compliance with the OVC grant. This includes primarily output data: number and type of victim services; the coalition's collaborative partners; and training activities. Finally, part D presents a survey designed to be used in the future by RST in order to evaluate client satisfaction for victim services.

## FINDINGS: Part A

Part A includes qualitative data gathered from the interviews conducted with members of CTCAHT, both service providers and law enforcement officers. This section focuses on three areas: strengths of the coalition, barriers to service provision, and training efforts.

### I. Strengths of CTCAHT in meeting needs of victims of human trafficking

Six themes were identified by participants related to the strengths of CTCAHT in meeting the needs of victims and survivors of human trafficking:

- a. Consistency of membership and meetings
- b. Effective communication and trust-building among members
- c. Service coordination
- d. Members' motivation and commitment
- e. Policy support
- f. Service/resource availability

#### a. Consistency of membership and meetings

Participants described the coalition membership as being founded by a group of core members who have been actively committed since the formation of the coalition. This consistency in membership and informal leadership within the coalition is cited as an important strength. In addition, the consistency of meetings was identified by participants as a benefit to providing good victim services. The coalition has held regular, monthly member meetings since its creation in 2003.

A participant from local law enforcement noted,

I think there is a core group of the coalition that is represented every month in our meetings. It is a mix of people representing law enforcement, and there are members in the NGOs around the city... at this point I think it is a good core group.

#### b. Effective communication and trust-building among members

Related to the consistency of meetings, participants also identified effective communication and trust-building as benefits of the coalition. Meetings are productive and foster an open environment and the building of useful, efficient relationships among members. This environment promotes constructive self-analysis of past cases, in addition to keeping members informed of needs related to current and upcoming cases. A local law enforcement specialist described these relationships' influence on efficiency and access to services,

[Without the coalition, it would] take hours and days and days to get service. So I think by having the coalition, having the law enforcement task force, you know, just communicate with each other, and know what to expect, and know what's there, know that person provides what, how soon they can provide it depending day of the week, time of the day.

A participant representing federal law enforcement also commented on the benefits of building strong relationships and a team approach among coalition members to minimize inevitable case difficulties:

I think the challenges, I think they're going to be better... when you work together like we've been doing. I think the coalition lessens those challenges or makes those challenges a little easier. I think from what we've done in the past 3 years as a group on our coalition – knowing everybody, knowing the players – we've at least established that rapport with each other. We understand what agencies do. We know the people to call. We have their cell phone numbers. We don't just have a name. I mean we know that person. We've had discussions with them. We've met with them once a month. So we feel like we know everybody.... A few years ago I wouldn't have known who to call. Now I know not just one but a lot of people to call. I don't feel like I'm alone if I have a case and I don't think a lot of us do. I think that we feel like we have a case and we're going to work it together.

Coalition meetings have also built respect and trust between community and law enforcement groups who have not traditionally communicated well or trusted one another's motives, strategies, and protocols. One member notes,

I think that's helped, that us being together has helped us trust each other a little bit more, understand at least what everybody does...we communicate better than we probably would before...so that's been a big plus...

Initial coalition members' history of having already built relationships before the tough, sensitive cases arose was identified as a further benefit by a legal services provider, who said,

I think it sort of started as you know a get-together where people got along when there weren't cases yet and that I think that background helps us now to trust each other.

#### c. Service coordination

The initiation of a single point of contact (one case coordinator and project organizer) within RST has been the most important milestone in the improved coordination and delivery of services to victims and survivors of human trafficking. Prior to the development of the single point of contact communication was difficult between entities. Not only does the single point of contact serve as coalition chairperson, but she is also the case manager for victims receiving services. Thus, she is knowledgeable about the range of services available within the coalition and beyond. She has the support of coalition's host agency, RST, and is able to focus solely on human trafficking. The single point of contact model greatly improves consistency, efficiency, and effective coordination of services and coalition activities. As a representative of federal law enforcement noted,

I think that one thing that we have is really good, I think I just mentioned – is having a single point of contact. I am glad we have that, that makes all the difference in the world to not just to have group people that you meet every month and I still have to make 10 calls to get services for a victim. Knowing that the law enforcement can call one person, that works for them. They love having it too. Knowing that, who that person is, and trusting that person and being able to coordinate. I just want to know that it's going to happen. You're going to take

care of it, but they can't know that with a whole bunch of people that change all the time. So, that's one of the smarter things that we have in Austin, it's our coalition,... [and] that we have a single point of contact that coordinates- that rules it, and that person also liaisons over at the task force. That has been really a good deal.

The fact that several coalition members, including the single point of contact at RST, serve on both the CTCAHT and the federal law enforcement task force also enhances effective coordination of coalition activities. One coalition member explained,

I think if I was an NGO person who knew that they were meeting, you know even though maybe separately coalition-task force, I still think I would feel better knowing that... I like the fact that we're in Austin and people are taken serious on those sides. Law enforcement is welcome to come to coalition. They'd rather go to the law enforcement one, whatever, cause you know they're going to talk about cases, but the bottom line is we are in the same town, we know everybody and there's people that overlap in those groups. Because I go to both, X goes to both and then we can kind of be the ones that kind of relay what's going on and people know that... I just think it shows that people are interested.

Finally, effective coordination of services increases the access and appropriate referrals to community services. A sexual assault specialist described this increased access:

If a client was [seeking services] on their own, I think it would be harder for them to know what is out there and what is available to them. With the coordination with the advocates, everything falls into place.

A participant representing family violence services described the improvement in appropriate referrals to community resources:

I do feel like because there is cohesion that there's been pretty good referrals for as much capacity as we have. Folks have been referred to legal services, to health screening, to therapeutic services. For what we have, I think people have been offered sort of that spectrum, and I think that is because the coalition exists and we know each other and we know what the community has to offer.

#### d. Members' motivation and commitment

Participants highlighted a fourth component of effective service delivery to victims of trafficking: the high level of commitment and motivation evident among coalition members. This enthusiasm was evident from the early stages of the coalition's creation, before financial support was made available. A representative of federal criminal justice noted,

It's nice that everybody was moving even before there was any grant money for 2 years anyway... not like we are doing it because of the grant... Everybody was motivated and cared about this issue.

Motivation also stems from a heightened awareness of the consequences involved in failing to maintain the coalition's efforts, as described by a federal law enforcement participant,

For 3 years we've kind of stayed pretty cohesive ... I think we've all stuck together because we know it's important and we're all scared to death to have a case and not be able to have what we need for that.

Furthermore, the commitment exhibited by coalition members goes well beyond personal or professional interest and enthusiasm. A participant representing federal criminal justice identified an additional benefit resulting from coalition members' motivation,

I think there is real spirit of cooperation, and people bring their resources to the table. I don't think people have been resistant to offering all they could. I think people been very generously offering the services of their agencies and not expecting anything in return. That's been impressive.

#### e. Policy support

A provider of sexual assault counseling services described the effect the coalition has had on her agency's policies towards serving victims and survivors of human trafficking:

When I first started as a member of the coalition the idea of serving trafficking victims wasn't really part of what we do, but as we educated our staff about what [a] trafficking victim has suffered and what they have been through, we were like, yes, they are someone we will serve.

In addition, by increasing eligibility policies to include victims and survivors of human trafficking, the same participant was able to institute a wait list policy to deem "trafficking victims a priority so they get in to see the counselors a lot quicker."

While not a result of CTCAHT's activities, federal policies (such as the TVPA) also clearly support the work of coalition members. A federal law enforcement officer described the legal obligation to provide services and its impact on her agency's accountability in actively serving clients:

The [federal] agents are actually responsible for filling out the paperwork for continued presence. We have to make sure that they have access to services... You know, so we have to do that. And other victims, you know, it's the right thing to do maybe, but you're not legally held to that with other types of victims so there's a little bit more with the trafficking.

#### f. Service availability

Finally, participants identified the breadth of community services available in Austin as a strength of the coalition's ability to serve victims and survivors of trafficking. Emergency resources such as housing, medical services, and food were identified as adequate. A local law enforcement representative described the range of services,

The coalition is made of up various organizations. You know there is refugee services that can provide housing, case management. You know here at victim services, we can provide counseling for short term basis for any emotional, you know,... if there is any psychological needs we can arrange with the local MHMR centers for services for medication, evaluations, stuff like that. Health departments can provide medical screening with screens for TB, (other)

diseases,... give a physical, to make sure that their health is taken into consideration. And then more ongoing stuff like give them some education, ESL classes, some job coaching trainings, things like that. I may be missing some, but there is a variety.

## II. Barriers to services for victims of human trafficking

Participants identified six challenges related to serving victims and survivors of human trafficking:

- a. Lack of standardized protocols
- b. Inadequate resources and available services
- c. Barriers within law enforcement procedures
- d. Fear and emotional needs of victims/survivors
- e. Cultural competence barriers
- f. Communication and information barriers

### a. Standardized protocols

Multiple participants identified the need to develop protocols for a standard response to trafficking cases, and specifically, responses for short- and long-term contingency plans for big groups. The lack of a standard protocol was identified by a legal services provider as creating potential for conflicts among coalition members:

I think there is conflict pending. It is sort of inevitable -- conflicts that we are going to have that we haven't worked out yet that could be very bad if we don't have some sort of protocol in place.

Standard protocols could also serve as protection against the inevitable loss of expertise following member agency staff turnovers, as noted by one participant,

The danger I guess is that unless we get some written protocols in place, we are going to start seeing people moving on and over and up and it's like starting all over again.

Furthermore, creating a standard response could serve as a planning and accountability tool for quick identification of the individual as a victim of a severe form of trafficking for the purposes of Continued Presence or a T-Visa, initial assessment of needs, and immediate and longer-term services to victims. A local law enforcement officer described a timeline dictating initial service delivery:

I think having a better I don't know having a better plan, like a time line you know, the time line starts at the house within 24 hours, this is supposed to happen and within 48 this is supposed to happen, you know within you know 72 and 96 this should have already happened and little stuff like that may be developing a questionnaire that we could ask the victims, whether they can answer, if they can read or write.

It should be noted that following the addition of the single point of contact, RST did create and begin using a standard questionnaire to assess initial needs of victims. It is also important to

note that this change seems in line with the development and growth of the coalition. Discussions about guidelines, standards and protocols and timelines indicate formalization and a commitment to this work.

Research participants also expressed fear that a growing anti-immigrant sentiment felt nationwide may divide the coalition and impact member agencies' responses to trafficking. Likewise, it was noted that the approach and definition of what it means to be a victim of human trafficking already differs among providers. Thus, there exist discrepancies in determining whether a victim is eligible for services or whether a case meets the requirements necessary for investigation and/or prosecution.

An additional barrier cited by research participants was the need for more active participation from certain disciplines and/or increased coalition membership. For example, participants noted the need for representation by the following groups: public assistance programs such as Medicaid, Social Security Administration; chambers of commerce; child protective services, the housing authority; federal and state prosecutors, and area hospitals (Seton and Brackenridge, in particular). Again, this feedback indicates the positive growth of the coalition.

Other comments on coordination barriers included that the services are possibly segmented and not holistic. Another participant noted that while the RST case manager's role is clearly understood, increased clarity about the roles of other coalition members would be helpful.

#### b. Inadequate resources and available services

Multiple research participants identified inadequate resources as a barrier facing the coalition. At all levels, member agencies need additional time and resources in order to provide adequate services. There is a sense of overwhelm experienced by several coalition members, regarding the ability to comply with a variety of individual agency responsibilities and commitments. Respondents cited large trafficking cases as particularly taxing on time and financial resources.

One local law enforcement officer described competing internal demands as a barrier to investigation and prosecution procedures:

We are all are over worked and under paid,... Besides human trafficking, my unit does other stuff as well, not just human trafficking cases so that caseload. The same response I get is from FBI or DAs office, 'we got too many cases and we can't do this.' There is a code of law on the books and we have only 5 agents or 3 agents. You got to find a means to have your people trained to know what are the elements for human trafficking.

The same participant identified additional funding for federal agencies as a need, stating that,

Additional funding for U.S. Attorney's office, for the additional funding for the federal agencies, additional funding for more service providers and of course the witness that we need to show up to make it successful.

Additional funding for services outside of pre-certification services was also identified as a need by a representative of federal criminal justice, who noted, RST's grant from OVC is targeted for services to victims who are awaiting certification for benefits through HHS/ORR, or victims within the "pre-certification phase."



[One thing being worked on is] getting that volunteer base filled up, and I think that's going to be really helpful,.. Another issue with the coalition is that most of their grant money really lies in providing pre-certification services and I feel [it's a] problem, because most of the services [are] provided after certification so we [need to] find a way to either do additional grant for post certification here in Austin for NGO services or find someone else who can do it.

Secondly, participants identified the difficulty for victims and the prosecution during the vulnerable time period between rescue, service provision, and obtaining work authorization. It is extremely difficult for victims to give up any type of "income" after rescue and before work permits are issued, reducing their incentive to participate in the case. For that reason, participants suggested that funding for incidental costs (such as personal items, cigarettes, etc.) would be helpful,

You know pulling these people out of those situations and (we're) basically taking whatever money they had,... They can't go buy their cigarettes because they have no money. And that was an issue in the past case, whether money could be used to support (habits like smoking), but you know they have to have it,... So, we (contributed personal) money to buy cigarettes.

Participants also identified the following gaps in available community services: housing, services for minors, counseling specifically for trafficking victims, transportation, and medical treatment. Different caseloads require different services, and the full continuum may not be available. For example, both urgent medical care and long-term services for chronic health problems were identified as unmet needs in the Austin community. While the community's refugee health screening clinic provides initial medical assessments, one member pointed out, "they're really only supposed to be providing services once the person is certified."

A medical services provider suggested that,

VOTs should have priority in clinics. Medical services need to be provided on demand. [The community hospital] needs a policy- a separate one for VOTs, and immediately. Hospitals should be included in training.

In addition, a representative of family violence programs described the need for a greater pool of individual advocates to support victims,

I just really feel like that supportive advocacy piece, like you could have a bus with 30 victims and you know half of them or more than half are 13 to 16 year old girls, you know, they probably would want, and ideally would have liked each of them to have an advocate and that was the person that drove them everywhere so they wouldn't have to take the bus alone. I feel like we probably don't have the level of advocacy that could be needed by some victims.

A sexual assault services provider described the need for adequate housing accommodations for victims:

I had a sense also that housing was an issue. Like there were several living together and it might have been a tight fit kind of space, so not much you know privacy was also the sense that I got but I don't know who else would take care of that aspect of it. Because I know it was under the guidelines that they were

being housed but I don't know if people stopped to think well if you're being housed, you're being offered a service- how comfortable are you in that situation? How adequate is it?

Another participant described the need for adequate housing and independent living resources for large cases:

If we had shelters just for people like that where they could take 20 or 30 people at a time - wouldn't that be great. But I know that that is probably something that won't happen. But there are shelters for battered women, there's rape crisis stuff. But those are usually full, and they can't usually take a bunch of people. But if there's a place we could put a mixed population for long-term or however long we need it and maybe have some programs set up in there like independent living and those kinds of things so they can that stuff right away.

Some of the services used for victims of trafficking are designed for other populations and may not be an ideal match. For example, a legal services provider noted that,

A lot of services we offer are a little more domestic violence oriented or sexual assault oriented so I think when you try and fit trafficking victims into that it gets a little frustrating for everyone involved so I think there is no real trafficking services out there.

Finally, participants identified the availability of services for minor victims as a barrier in the Austin area. Until they are transferred to an identified Unaccompanied Refugee Minor (URM) program in another city, shelter for minor victims is a barrier. However, it was noted that a positive resource is being currently developed by a coalition member agency that provides services to at-risk and homeless youth. Additionally, the transition to school can be hard for children used to being independent, and it may cost their participation in the program and prosecution. A representative of federal criminal justice described the barrier:

Well, for minors of course there is nothing here, but that really can't change unless we got one of the...if [a community youth organization] gets the grant they have applied for then we will be in great shape in Central Texas because we will have full service. They are providing services to runaways anyway so it will be a perfect match where we can get the trafficking grant too and get paid for what they are doing free for us anyway, so that's what I am hoping- that's a gap,...We have no services for minors. We can't even keep them here and so we ship them off and they end up in foster families very quickly. But foster families really don't work for all of them. Some of them [have] just been on their own too long and they [would] really be better in independent living, life skills and getting a job.

The same participant described a case example involving minors,

Whereas for two of those girls, had not been in school since 5<sup>th</sup> grade going over there and have been prostituting for quite a while but on their own, they both have children back in Mexico. The best option for them was job training, appropriate job training, something besides prostitution, which they are willing to do, but they couldn't do [job training], because they were forced to go into school. And two of them chose to go back to Mexico, because they couldn't make it in school. If they had seen, they could have done job training, they [might] still be

here. I thought that was unrealistic for some of these kids,... It's fine if the child wants to take advantage of that, if, but if they can't new alternatives, GED,...

### c. Barriers within law enforcement procedures

The processes of identification, investigation, and prosecution of trafficking cases were identified as a significant barrier to the work of the coalition. In addition, research participants described similar challenges in waiting times for obtaining the proper certification and documentation during these law enforcement procedures.

Related to the identification and investigation of cases, participants described the lack of self-identification among victims, especially men, as an initial obstacle. Furthermore, cases are often presented to law enforcement or social service providers looking like something other than trafficking. Historically, they have been treated as smuggling cases. When it comes to specific cases, members of the coalition still disagree over what is considered trafficking and what is not. One participant describes this discrepancy and members' views on the coalition's responsibilities:

Some people are coming from much for me a more narrow view than that, and some people are coming from such a vastly greater and broader philosophy than that, that I think that's been a hard rub. Because when you say that those are just illegal aliens that were smuggled and not under the definition of trafficking, you've got half of the room that hears something else - that those are victims of crime, that there are other remedies available, there are definitely resources that they are entitled to, and they don't believe that those folks should have gotten deported. And there's the other half of the table that's saying, we're talking about victims of trafficking. If they don't meet the statutory definition, and folks that are here without documentation get deported, period.

Proper and prompt certification and documentation were also identified by participants as an obstacle to providing victim services. Prior to the special grant program, victims are not eligible for some services until they are certified and have proper documentation. Frustrations obtaining social security numbers, work authorization documents, and visas were noted by representatives of social services and law enforcement alike. In particular, victims' ability to work was identified as a stumbling block, as one participant explains:

I wish that there was a faster way to get them [trafficking victims] [proper documentation], because I think they want to work, they want to do something. I think sitting around and waiting for things for days or weeks and sometimes months, can be... I mean it's hard to expect somebody to be able to do that without going crazy or wanting to do something and maybe just wanting to go back or giving up. And we want them to stay here, we want them to be happy, we want them to be taken care of and I think that we don't want them to get bored and feel useless and I think that the reason why many of them are here is to make some money, to work- if those kinds of things can happen faster.

Lack of prompt legal status also affects the safety and security of trafficking victims, as noted by a federal law enforcement representative:

I've got these three victims that are waiting on a U visa and this other case for 6 to 7 to 8 months already. And so, we've got to transfer them to Del Rio cause

they're not legal yet and we don't want them to get stopped and you know, they have subpoenas and there's paperwork that says they are victims in this case, we need them but there's not anything, you know we're afraid so we're taking them ourselves because we are afraid of that. But if they had proper documentation we could, you know they could go over there on their own.

Finally, delay in the prosecution of trafficking cases was identified as a significant barrier in the process. Social services providers and local law enforcement described the problem as a lack of resources, training, and priority in prosecuting cases on the part of the U.S. Attorney General's Office. One participant noted,

For the U.S. Attorney's office, too, these cases are very, very, very difficult. And they demand a lot of resources and time to prosecute and a lot of coordination among many other law enforcement agencies. And quite honestly I can't speak for the office, but just by what I have learned from being in the group is that, in some instances, it [trafficking cases] is not something that they will pursue—because they may feel like they can't put a case together.

A local law enforcement officer described the frustration with getting cases prosecuted and a lack of commitment to prosecute trafficking cases. It is important to note here that because of the complexity of these cases, prosecutors need training, resources, and peer support from other U.S. Attorneys Offices in order to take on trafficking cases. Furthermore, a local law enforcement officer noted that the delay in or lack of prosecution may eventually increase the victims' reluctance to participate in an investigation and testify in a case. The participant also suggested that the coalition membership should include a prosecutor, stating that,

Something has to change in the U.S. attorney's office in order for all these to be successful. We had victims that were cooperating, who were willing to stand and testify but yet as the months pass by, they lost hope and some of them left. We all need to be on board. The U.S. attorney's office says that they are part of our coalition. ...There needs to be a prosecutor at [our] table.

#### d. Fear and emotional needs of victims/survivors

Victims of human trafficking face tremendous fears and trauma, for which they need immediate and ongoing emotional support. These include concerns about continued harm towards themselves or their families inflicted by the traffickers, uncertainty about the future and financial survival, newly-identified health concerns and unresolved immigration status. One participant described the specific fear of being deported that many participants face:

I think that the fear of being deported is a big issue for them - like what will happen if I do or say that I'm a trafficking victim, you know everybody doesn't want to go back because they're here, they want to work, they want to give money back to the family that needs it. I think that's a big factor that there is a fear that they have so they won't speak out.

Ongoing advocacy and emotional support of victims was identified as an important need. Given the traumatic situations that trafficking victims experience, they need to know, "that not every person they're coming into contact with is about to victimize them... that kind of assurance needs to be there and just at a really basic level." A provider of counseling services for victims

and survivors described the need to make early and appropriate referrals to mental health services:

It's really hard [for victims] to come here, to talk about these issues and I think maybe, again this is the connection, that if we started talking to them earlier in the process about what this is about and that counseling might be able to help deal with those issues that more would come more consistently but overall we see this in general. People will come for a couple of sessions and then they'll tend to drop out, especially when you start to get to the real difficult stuff that they're not ready to get to many times. All of those issues combined but I have a strong feeling that if we started to talking them earlier about...building that support system for them around counseling and their emotional well-being that maybe that would be helpful.

Local and national anti-immigrant sentiment also discourage victims from coming forward. In one participant's words, "it is just not a [good] time to be illegal in this country right now." Another coalition member reflects on broader policies affecting immigrants:

I felt like the more immigrant-friendly policies that we have, the more easily people are going to come out of those kinds of situations, and not be completely petrified to come forward. I feel like there is huge discrepancy between the statute and what really happens as far as certification in terms of immigration relief and benefits for victims of trafficking.

#### e. Cultural competence barriers

Participants also pointed to the lack of culturally competent services as a barrier to victim services, particularly the availability of services provided in a victim's first language. For example, one participant noted that no Spanish-speaking foster families in Texas are available to house Spanish-speaking minor victims of trafficking. Therefore, language barriers and the lack of availability of bi-lingual foster families in Texas is a major issue for minor victims. RST and other refugee service agencies have bi-lingual staff and extensive interpreter services available to them for adult victims. However, the lack of bi-lingual community services is problematic. A counselor described the further need for linguistically appropriate medical and mental health services, saying,

I think they [victims] encountered a psychiatrist that didn't speak English, and so there were some issues around not feeling comfortable with the service providers that they initially met, which is my sense from just getting to know them. And so you know if you give them a prescription for depression or to sleep, they're not buying into prescription medication, they're not going to take it. And if they are not quite sure how to take it or how to administer it because maybe that wasn't explained to them in their language. That's complicated too. So, early on I'm sort of seeing that just the basic needs weren't met with cultural sensitivity or just a better understanding of, 'if I prescribe this medication, will they even want to take it?'

A local law enforcement representative also expressed the need for more culturally-appropriate food choices upon initial rescue of victims. He recalled a group of victims from Mexico who,

... wanted to cook for themselves, and they were given frozen American dinners and stuff like that. You know they didn't finish the food. I think more consideration should have been taken into you know let's get them, sounds stereotypical, but rice, beans, tortillas and that's what they eat. We should have accommodated that, the diets. And because they did not know what to do with some of the food that we brought. [They said,] we don't eat sandwiches. It is not how they are raised to eat and so I think more consideration should be put into that and it is comfort for [their] anxiety, and I think it would have made a big difference.

It is important to note that efforts are made to locate shelter and housing that have kitchens, in order for victims and survivors to be able to cook and eat as needed. In the case mentioned above, the safety of the original housing was compromised, which lead to an emergency move to a new location. The second location did not have food preparation facilities, and RST purchased foods that could be prepared without a kitchen. These circumstances challenge the agency's ability to ensure cultural appropriateness of food.

#### f. Communication and information barriers among Coalition members

Participants identified a final barrier to their work with victims of trafficking: communication and the flow of information. Participants noted that there is a lack of awareness about local trafficking statistics – who is collecting data, what data is being collected, and whether it is compiled in a useful manner. Greater productivity of monthly meetings was also identified as a need, with various suggestions for improvement. For example, one participant expressed the need for more communication in between the monthly meetings. Another suggested having quarterly meetings, as opposed to monthly meetings, due to lower attendance. A third coalition member recommended having smaller, informal monthly meetings, with the addition of one or two large, well-facilitated and well-organized gatherings. The fact that coalition members desire more information and more involvement indicates the positive coalition growth and commitment of members.

One coalition member noted that a better and more respectful understanding of various members' roles is needed:

I think the more we look to and respect people's specific expertise and roles, the more folks are going to have a motivation to come to the meeting and feel needed. I feel if you never look to, this is an example – if you never look to the immigration attorney in the room when an immigration law question comes up, then they are going to feel they really [do not]? need to come there... And so I think the more that we respect each other's role and listen to each other's expertise, the retention will be better and better.

Finally, a law enforcement representative expressed a desire to offer coalition members more detailed information earlier on during an investigation, so that service providers can be better prepared. He noted that basic information is already provided, such as type of trafficking situation and language need, and that further information may be unnecessarily withheld due to concerns about investigation procedures.

### III. Training efforts

The coalition, in collaboration with the law enforcement task force, has organized and conducted two annual training conferences in Austin, Texas. Both conferences were well-attended and considered a success by coalition organizers and attendees. Appendices D and E include the training evaluation and results gathered during the 2006 CTCHT training conference held in Austin, Texas. A third training is scheduled for the summer of 2007.

Research participants expressed that the trainings improve each year, become more professional, and reach larger and more varied numbers of participants. Attendance by social service providers and law enforcement has been good. Motivation to continue providing and expanding training opportunities has been high since the creation of CTCAHT. The first training conference in 2004 was a volunteer effort before grant funding was available to the coalition, with resources provided from a variety of coalition member agencies and outside experts. It should be noted that the coalition formed a new sub-committee in 2006, which is focused on outreach education and targeting specific audiences previously not reached by other trainings. The sub-committee has been successful in compiling and modifying existing training resources, identifying target audiences, and scheduling outreach education.

Widespread training has been accomplished jointly by CTCAHT and the law enforcement task force. Coalition member agencies have also been successful in providing internal training within their agencies. The Austin Police Department, in particular, is training its officers to better identify victims. One local law enforcement officer described the Department's goal to "train every officer in Austin Police Department on human trafficking matters. Of course human trafficking comes in every shape and size, different scenarios that you can encounter in human trafficking so the officers they have at least some idea of what it is."

Although the coalition's training efforts have been outstanding, the need for further education persists. Participants identified the need to continue training new audiences (in particular, child welfare agencies and prosecutors), in addition to offering advanced training for those already familiar with trafficking. Advanced training topics would include training on the use of psychological coercion, the impact of trauma and abuse, specific cultural practices, etc. One federal law enforcement representative described the complex nature of trafficking cases and the importance of continued education:

Somebody said one time and I never forgot - if you work one trafficking case, you work one trafficking case. You know what I mean, you haven't worked them all. Because they are so different, you know,... This is something that's really kind of new. You know I've done presentations on it, I've gone to this coalition for three years, I still feel like I'm still learning about it.

Finally, some respondents identified the need to combine sessions for non-governmental organization participants and law enforcement participants. While most training conferences already emphasize the importance of collaboration among law enforcement and non-governmental agencies, there is an expressed desire for more fully integrated trainings. Other participants noted the benefits in separating out the entities. For example, law enforcement often trains on specific and highly confidential investigative techniques. In addition, non-governmental and law enforcement agencies may find some benefit in separate training sessions, in order to explore stereotypes about historically tense relationships and the collaborative process in a comfortable and protected atmosphere. Decisions and rationale on separating or integrating training sessions may need to be fully communicated to training audiences.

## FINDINGS: Part B

Part B represents data collected during interviews with victims and survivors of human trafficking who received services from RST, pertaining particularly to services needed by victims. This section includes the following five sections:

- a. Services provided
- b. Strengths of services
- c. Barriers to accessing community services for victims of human trafficking
- d. Strengths of victims/survivors
- e. Goals for future in the United States

It is important to note that the victims and survivors interviewed in this evaluation were served during early stages of program development and prior to the existence of a dedicated trafficking case manager. Thus, in responding to questions about services received, participants often referred to caseworkers from Refugee Services of Texas, Inc., as opposed to the case manager and program as it currently operates.

### a. Services provided

The following victim services are provided by RST and are included in their reports to OVC (see Appendix C):

- Victim needs assessment
- Immediate and ongoing medical attention
- Housing – immediate and permanent
- Mental health assessment and referral to counseling
- Referral for legal representation and immigration assistance
- Job preparation
- Financial assistance and budgeting orientation
- Cultural orientation
- Orientation to city and public transportation system
- Assistance applying to public benefit programs
- Interpreter services

Services identified during victim/survivor interviews included immediate assistance, such as food, clothing, personal hygiene products, transportation and hotel accommodation. Identified services also included assistance with public benefit applications, medical appointments, ESL classes, employment services, computer classes, counseling appointments, grocery gift cards, obtaining identification cards, seeking work permits, and completing visa paper work.

One participant described the assistance she received after arriving in Austin:

After arriving in Austin, services included hotel accommodations, clothes and shoes to change into, seeing a doctor quickly, and food. RST visited us regularly. I have no complaints. Everything they gave us helped a lot. This included rent when we moved into an apartment, transportation to doctors' offices, food, directions to go to ESL classes.



Another participant identified beneficial services she received, including counseling support:

In the beginning, they took us to the doctor for a check-up. They gave us food. They also took us somewhere for help, like someone to talk with us, because we felt a little confused due to the situation, all that – new things for us. So we were feeling a little, well it was almost like a trauma. So someone who could talk to us. Someone who could ask us how we felt and such.

#### b. Strengths of services

In addition to listing services and benefits received during pre-certification and post-certification phases, victim and survivor participants identified specific strengths of these services, including a sense of safety, support and trust in the service providers, assistance addressing the language barrier, and the ability to communicate with family in their home country.

Participants expressed that they felt safe and protected while receiving services from RST and that they trusted the people who helped them. One participant who was nearing the end of her services through RST described the trust she had in the agency, in addition to a new sense of empowerment and independence. She said, “so I felt a lot of trust in them. I can try it. If I feel like I am going to have trouble or not be able to do it, I know they are there. That is what most helped me.”

Another participant noted that assistance went beyond the level of perfunctory service delivery:

They haven’t just helped us with getting the documents and all this, but they also helped me morally. Not just physically, but also morally, because I came practically destroyed from that place. I was accustomed to a different environment, and I really wanted to get out of that.

When asked to identify the most helpful aspect of her services, another participant said,

It would be the support. To have someone to confide in, someone to support me. Someone to whom I can say, “I want to go here, and I don’t know how.” Or, “I want to do this or that.” Or simply, “I feel sad.” Or, “I miss my family.” Or “I want to go to Mexico.” And they were there to listen to me, to advise me.

In addition, the phone cards provided by RST made life easier, as they could contact family members back home and speak to them. This opportunity relieved anxiety among victims and survivors, many of whom feared for the safety and well-being of their children, in particular. One victim described the difficulty of being far from family and how the phone cards helped:

When all these things happen, you just want to be with your mother, your siblings. But also what always helped us was that they always had long distance cards for us. So we couldn’t be with them personally, but with the telephone you can at least hear them.

#### c. Barriers to accessing community services for victims of human trafficking

Participants cited several barriers to accessing a variety services. These barriers included cultural and linguistic competence, transportation, and social isolation.

Mirroring a barrier identified by a law enforcement representative in part A, victim participants identified obtaining appropriate food as a struggle during the early days following rescue. One noted, “the problem was that the food they gave us, sometimes we didn’t eat. Because it was canned food, and we are not accustomed to eating food like that.” It should be noted that this barrier has been addressed by RST in the implementation of both an initial needs assessment and by distributing grocery gift cards, so that clients can purchase foods they want and need. In addition, RST attempts to secure housing and shelter with food preparation facilities so that victims and survivors can prepare their food as desired. However, this may not always be possible given the limited availability of safe shelter options.

Cultural barriers faced by participants also included discomfort with individual and group counseling services. One participant expressed dissatisfaction with individual counseling. She reported, “I didn’t like going to the psychologist. I went 2 or 3 times, and I felt worse when I went. I got more depressed when I went, remembering everything.”

Another participant described discomfort she experienced with a series of group workshops she was mandated to attend:

So, I told X [the caseworker], “X, I don’t get along well with the others.” Because of my manner, or I just don’t communicate with them. And the workshops were such that we all had to share experiences that we’ve lived, what we have learned. If I tell them what I have lived and how I am now, they are going to laugh at me. So X told me, “No. You have to go.” So I thought, perhaps they won’t realize that I didn’t go. So I said, I am not going to go, because when it is my turn to answer a question, I will answer and the rest will make fun of me. Because they had already done so on other occasions. I didn’t want this to happen again, because it made me feel bad.

Furthermore, participants cited the language barrier as one of the main hurdles in accessing services. Due to this barrier, participants expressed that they needed more assistance with receiving medical services and with completing paper work related to public benefits and immigration relief. For example, one participant described the effect this had on her ability to schedule a medical appointment;:

And I don’t know how to make an appointment and ask off my job. If I call, they answer in English. And in order to get to the hospital, I don’t know which hospital to go to. I only went once to the doctor with them. And I don’t know if I should go to the same place or a different place or if there is a clinic I should go to. I didn’t ask this. I didn’t ask [the caseworker], and I don’t know if I can still ask her. I don’t know.

Another participant described a similar experience attending a medical appointment without proper language interpretation, saying that,

What happened to us one time was that they took us to the hospital. To the clinic. And what happened was that the man who usually interpreted for us was busy, so X took us. And he doesn’t speak Spanish. And we wanted to ask him something, to tell him something, and he didn’t understand us.

Transportation and mobility were also identified as barriers for victims. Participants mentioned feelings of helplessness and of being trapped in their hotel room during the initial days before apartment accommodations were made. Some did not approve of the location of the hotel. Once employment was found, some participants struggled with the lack of time and transportation to apply for ongoing services available to mainstream populations.

Finally, participants faced social isolation when getting to know the new community and being unable to see family members. One participant described the difficulty adjusting to a new community after being rescued from a trafficking situation in a different city:

So I said, “I am going to stay to live here? I don’t believe it.” That was very difficult, because I didn’t know anything about here. The people are different. I was used to living there, because I had been there a year. To make a life here in Austin? Not knowing anyone? And here it is smaller.

#### d. Strengths of trafficking victims

Several strengths emerged in the data gathered from victims and survivors of trafficking, and these proved instrumental in participants’ abilities to survive and succeed. For example, one participant described her belief in faith, God, and prayer as a tremendous benefit:

Now I cover everything with prayer. I cover everything. I carry it to God. I pray about the children [of the trafficker] because the children loved me so much. I pray even for the man. I forgive him.

For some victims, the group experience of surviving the trauma of being trafficked may have contributed to their inner strength. Others noted that independence from others (victims and service providers) would be most beneficial. One participant described this view:

Because I think that if I am always dependent on someone else, I will never progress. And I think that here in this country, one of the things you need to survive is to have the bravery, be brave in order to do what you have to do.

Their strong zeal to fend for themselves and for their families back home helped them to become more self-sufficient, learn English, and adjust to the new environment. One participant reported being thankful for finding employment, “Yes, thank the Lord. The most important is that we have work. We are becoming a little more settled.”

#### e. Goals for future in the United States

Related to inner strengths, victim and survivor participants developed clearly defined goals for their future lives in the United States. Examples of these goals included: find or maintain employment, gain residency in the U.S., become proficient in English, complete a GED, open a bank account, and begin a career. According to one participant, “there are many [goals]. The most important is to have a house here, or something of my own. So I can bring my child here.”

Bringing a child or children to the U.S. was a common theme. Participants expressed a strong desire to bring their families, especially their children, to the United States for better education and a better future. One participant said, “I would like to make my life here. And to give a future to my son – bring him here so that he can study.” Participants also recognized a connection

between the above-mentioned goals of employment and self-sufficiency and the goal of bringing children to the U.S.,

If my son weren't there, my mother would go live with another family. With my son that is difficult. So bringing my son here, taking him to a safer place, then my mother could,... I wouldn't keep worrying about it. But for now to work. To work and to learn English, because it is very necessary.

Interestingly, another participant described her goal to bring her family to the U.S., but also to build a house in her home country, saying that,

If I bring my children here. If I get money, we will make a good house in my home country. I have a house, but my husband didn't fix it for me. He died early. My whole children, my 6 children don't know my husband.

## FINDINGS: Part C

Part C presents data collected by RST, in compliance with the OVC grant. This includes primarily output data: number and type of victim services; the coalition's collaborative partners; and training activities.

Table 2. Clients on the Current Caseload

<b>Trafficking Population</b>	<b>Number of Clients</b>
<b>Total Clients Served</b>	20
<b>Total Existing Active Clients Served</b>	1
<b>Total Existing Inactive Clients Served</b>	4
<b>Total Client Cases</b>	<b>25</b>

Table 3. Trafficking Client Certification Status by Number and Type of Trafficking Clients

<b>Client Certification Status</b>	<b>Sex Only</b>	<b>Labor Only</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Pre-certified</b>	1	9	10
<b>Became Certified</b>	14	1	15
<b>Already Certified Before Entered</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>

Table 4. Total Number of Adult Trafficking Clients by Gender and Type of Trafficking

<b>Types of Trafficking Clients</b>	<b>Number of Adults Represented in this Category</b>		
	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Sex</b>	0	15	15
<b>Labor</b>	3	6	9
<b>Both Sex and Labor</b>	0	0	0
<b>Other</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>

Table 5. Countries of Origin of Trafficking Clients

Country of Origin	Number of Clients
El Salvador	12
Honduras	3
Mexico	7
Nigeria	1
South Africa	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>

Table 6. Immigration Status of Trafficking Clients upon Entering the United States by Type of Trafficking

Immigration Status Upon Entering the United States	Number of Trafficking Clients			
	Sex Only	Labor Only	Both Sex and Labor	Total
K-Visa (Marriage Visa)	0	0	0	0
Student Visa	0	0	0	0
Temporary Work Visa	0	1	0	1
No Documentation	15	7	0	22
Other (specify)	0	2	0	2

Table 7. Target Audiences for Training Events by Organization Type and Number of Attendees

Training Event	Target Audience(s) for Training Event	Number of Attendees
<b>Introduction to Human Trafficking</b>	UT-School of Social Work students	60
	Brackenridge Emergency Room Social Workers	10
	National Association of Social Workers	13
	Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Staff	40

Table 8. Total Units of Service Provided to Trafficking Clients by Type of Service

Types of Service	Total Units of Service Provided		
	Pre-certified Clients	Certified Clients	Total
Child Care	0	0	0
Clothing/Food	46	45	91
Criminal Justice System-based Victim Advocacy	0	2	2
Crisis Intervention or 24 Hour Hotline	2	3	5
Dental (Emergency and Long-Term)	1	0	1
Derivative Family Member Benefits	0	0	0
Emotional /Moral Support (Non-Mental Health Counseling)	38	25	63
Employment Assistance	15	16	31
Explanation of Legal Rights and Protections	1	0	1
Interpreter/Translator	3	1	4
Legal Services, including Immigration Advocacy	12	21	33
Literacy Education and/or Job Training	4	3	7
Locating/Providing Information and/or Referrals	28	13	41
Medical (Emergency and Long-Term)	20	14	34
Mental Health (Emergency and Long-Term)	1	10	11
Protection/Safety Planning	1	5	6
Repatriation	0	0	0
Social Service Advocacy and Explanation of Benefit Entitlements/Availability	0	0	0
Special Services for Child/Juvenile Victims	37	31	68
Substance Abuse Treatment	0	0	0
Transportation	33	3	36
Shelter/Housing	10	27	37
Other (specify)	23	19	42
<b>Grand Total Units of Services Provided</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>513</b>

Table 9. Total Number of Active Partner Organizations and Staff/Volunteers Working with Trafficking Clients

Type of Partners	Number of Organizations
Key Partner	14
Informal Partner	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

## FINDINGS: Part D

Finally, part D presents a survey designed to be used in the future by RST in order to evaluate client satisfaction for victim services. Due to the limitations of this study regarding the small sample size of victims and survivors, and also due to ongoing evaluation needs of RST and the Coalition, the research team collaborated with RST in designing a client satisfaction tool to be used with current and future clients.

This tool is intended to be administered orally by a volunteer or staff member of RST not directly involved in services to victims and survivors of trafficking. In order to encourage honest and open feedback from respondents, clients' names will not be collected, and the survey will be mailed to the RST address in Dallas. A copy of the client satisfaction survey is included in Appendix F. The survey may be modified in the future by RST as the program develops and as resources and client populations change.



## DISCUSSION

In large part, the findings presented in parts A, B, C and D illustrate a clear and positive description of the services provided to victims and survivors of human trafficking in Central Texas and of the collaborative and training efforts of CTCAHT. This section highlights both victim and provider participant data.

Participants from all sectors, including victims and survivors, described aspects of the Coalition that enhance effective identification and service delivery in human trafficking cases. The institution of a single point of contact, or the RST case manager and coalition chairperson, has clearly and positively impacted all aspects of the coalition's work. Other strengths include the relationship-building process among coalition members as well as relationship-building between victims and survivors and providers of service. This speaks to improved coordination of services, enhanced trust among coalition members and between victims/survivors and the case manager and more efficiently delivered services. Finally, a majority of participants responded that the coalition is successful at meeting the immediate and basic needs of victims and survivors.

A broad spectrum of participants identified common barriers that include the need for continued expansion of membership and appropriate referral sources (especially medical); lack of strategic planning for large groups of victims; lack of encouragement of aggressive prosecution of cases; difficulty meeting cultural and linguistic needs of clients; and the gap and vulnerability for all victims, service providers, law enforcement and prosecution during the period before issuance of work authorization. Identified barriers lend themselves to clear recommendations for improved services and coalition operation, which are discussed in the next section of this report.

Participants agreed that the coalition has made tremendous strides in providing effective training opportunities, both to individual agencies and to the Coalition as a whole. Particular attention was drawn to the fact that these endeavors began as large and successful volunteer efforts before the coalition was funded. While training to date has been deemed a success, there exists a continued need for reaching other target audiences in addition to continuing advanced training modules for groups already familiar with the basics of trafficking. As long as traffickers continue shifting the ways in which this crime is committed and concealed, the community of service providers and law enforcement officials must remain proactive in developing innovative prevention and response strategies.

Clearly, the coalition and the client population consist of individuals who maintain varying perspectives and points of view about human trafficking. Given this aspect of human nature, it is not surprising that the data include conflicting findings. For example, one participant felt that the monthly coalition meetings were too large and cumbersome and recommended smaller monthly meetings and larger annual meetings. Another participant would prefer larger quarterly meetings. The evaluations collected after the 2006 training conference held in Austin include other examples of conflicting preferences. Thus it becomes the task of the coalition leadership to sort through these differences in opinions, make informed choices, and communicate those decisions to coalition membership. Nonetheless, the strengths of the coalition far outweigh these limitations. In fact, these disagreements are indicators of the viable working collaboration among coalition members and evidence that the coalition is growing and expanding.

It should also be noted that some responses were indicative of Coalition activities prior to the addition of the single point of contact and standardized RST practices. For example, in responding to questions about services received, victim and survivor participants, who received

services during the early stages of program development, often referred to caseworkers from Refugee Services of Texas, Inc., as opposed to the dedicated trafficking case manager and program as it currently operates. Some of the improvements in service delivery may not have been adequately communicated to the coalition as a whole. Also, coalition members who inconsistently or rarely attend meetings naturally have limited information about current service delivery and coalition activities. Sharing information by e-mail or the coalition website is one way to combat this, and coalition leadership should maintain a reasonable process to educate new and absentee members.

## RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION

Although this study described the many and varied strengths and accomplishments of the Central Texas Coalition Against Human Trafficking, participants identified several areas where growth and improvement are needed – both locally and nationally. Participants also readily recognized that due to the newness and complexity of this work, the need for continual assessment and research is to be expected and should not be considered a criticism of the tremendous successes already achieved by the coalition. The following twelve recommendations were identified specifically by research participants or the research team:

1. *Maintenance of single point of contact system.* In recognition of the great importance and impact of the single point of contact at RST, it is recommended that this system be maintained. Findings indicate that this has contributed greatly to the growth and improvement of coalition operation and victim services.
2. *Institutionalized protocols.* The Coalition should consider a formalized written protocol for delivering services to victims of human trafficking. The protocol should include timelines or benchmarks for creating accountability and evaluating the coalition's timely response to victims' needs. A protocol should with timelines and procedures for identification of victims and obtainment of law enforcement endorsement as a victim of a severe form of trafficking for the purpose of a T-Visa or Continued Presence status should also be developed. In the event that these protocols have already been formalized, this information should be communicated to the Coalition membership, to the extent that such sharing of information is possible and appropriate. Further we recommend the establishment of several types of types of protocols to address different scenarios. For example, protocols for raids, communication with the media regarding cases involving a large group of victims, referrals from law enforcement for services, and referrals of victims to law enforcement from the NGO, etc. may be mechanisms to strengthen the work of the Coalition.
3. *Development of strategic plan for larger groups.* The coalition, to date, has not worked with a case involving large numbers of victims. While a portion of another region's victim caseload was transferred to Austin for victim services, the coalition as a whole has not had the opportunity to address a large case from beginning to end. The coalition should continue efforts to plan strategically for large groups of victims, from identification and investigation, to longer-term case management.
4. *Expand sources of funding and support.* It is important that other sources of funding for the Coalition be explored. Grants, private sources of funding, and sub-contracts, for example, should be investigated to ensure a continuity of care for victims.
5. *Enhanced coalition communication.* While full case updates cannot be provided to general coalition membership meetings because of confidentiality, it would be helpful to briefly and consistently report the following: number of current cases under investigation (to the extent this can be shared), number of clients being served (both pre and post-certification) by RST. The opportunity should be given for other member agencies to report those being served outside RST. Some agencies serving clients who have not reported to law enforcement may not wish to share this information and should also be given the opportunity to decline such a report. All information shared should be general and not intended to identify any clients. Likewise, the sharing of information on cases

being investigated should include close scrutiny beforehand about the appropriate level of disclosure.

6. *Participation by target audiences.* The coalition should work towards including target audiences - such as federal and state prosecutors, child welfare agencies, medical institutions, public assistance programs such as Medicaid, Social Security Administration, chambers of commerce, and local housing authorities - in the active membership of the coalition and/or as future training participants.
7. *Attention to cultural sensitivity.* The coalition should pay greater attention to the cultural competence of coalition services in addition to the services for which clients are referred out to community agencies. In particular, participants described the need to attend to linguistic and cultural competence of medical and mental health providers, provide language interpretation when necessary and expand the availability of Spanish-speaking foster families in the URM system. One way that RST has already addressed a cultural sensitivity issue is distributing grocery cards so that clients can purchase their own food and attempting to find shelter with kitchens or other food preparation facilities. Another effort already underway by coalition members is the creation of an outreach committee to increase trainings to other agencies. Greater understanding of human trafficking in general will enhance awareness of the cultural and linguistic needs of the most commonly victimized populations.
8. *Special attention to services for minor victims of trafficking.* In addition to appropriate foster family placements for minor victims in the URM system, participants described the need for appropriate shelter and programs. In particular, more independent living programs for minors are needed.
9. *Medical services.* Extensive and responsive medical services need to be provided on demand. Brackenridge Hospital and other area medical facilities need to implement specific policies for serving victims/survivors of human trafficking. Medical providers also need to be included in training and outreach education.
10. *Competent mental health practices.* Earlier preparation for and referral to mental health services are needed. In addition, everyone working with victims/survivors of trafficking would benefit from improved understanding of trauma and the importance of preventing retraumatization.
11. *Volunteer base.* An enhanced volunteer base would build capacity for more comprehensive victim services and allay some of the social isolation that victims experience during the early stages of services. The safety of victims/survivors and of volunteers and the appropriate use of volunteers must remain a priority. This recommendation has already enjoyed considerable discussion and initiation within the coalition and RST.
12. *Amendment of Texas state trafficking law.* During the 80<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature legislative cycle, efforts are already underway to amend state law, H.B. 2096 passed during the 78<sup>th</sup> Legislature, to make it more usable for law enforcement and prosecutors. CTAHT should remain involved in providing model legislation from other states who have utilized their state trafficking laws with more frequency than Texas.

13. *Expanded research agenda.* This project reinforces and expands what many in the field of trafficking already understand about the struggles of this work, and findings should be used as a foundation for next steps. Continued research is vital to a better understanding of appropriate service delivery and to effective processing of trafficking cases. In short, providing appropriate case management and legal remedies to victims and survivors of human trafficking merits continual assessment and modification of current practices. It is also important that emerging, promising practices and interventions be empirically investigated and explored. There is also a need for more research on trafficking, and in particular, the broader issues of global poverty and why/how people are lured into trafficking, as victims and as traffickers. Research agendas must be developed in collaboration with coalition members and victims/survivors. After all, the needs and assets of both the victims of this crime as well as those seeking to prevent it will continually change, and the landscape within which we view trafficking will also be transformed.

It is critical that the research on human trafficking – the needs of victims and survivors in addition to best practices among community coalitions and law enforcement task forces – be expanded and fully integrated into both policy and practice. Likewise, researchers and policymakers must strive to view law enforcement officials, social service providers, and especially victims and survivors of human trafficking as experts on the challenges faced before, during, and after escaping human trafficking.

## REFERENCES

- Albanese, J., Donnelly, J.S., & Kelegian, T. (2004). Cases of human trafficking in the United States: A content analysis of a calendar year in 18 cities. *International Journal of Comparative Criminology*, 4(1), 96-111.
- Banzon, M. Y. L. (2005). Combating trafficking in persons through gender-focused strategy. *UN Chronicle*, 42(1), 56-60.
- Bhaba, J. (2004). Seeking asylum: Treatment of separated and trafficked children in need of refugee protection. *International Migration*, 42(1), 141-148.
- Brennan, D. (2005). Methodological challenges in research with trafficked persons: Tales from the field. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 35-54.
- Bump, M., Duncan, J., Godziak, E., & MacDonnell, M. (2005). Second conference on identifying and serving child victims of trafficking. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 342-363.
- Caliber Associates (an ICF International Company). (2007, April). *Evaluation of comprehensive services for victims of human trafficking: Key findings and lessons learned*. For the U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program, National Institute of Justice. Fairfax, VA: Author.
- Chacon, J. (2006). Misery and myopia: Understanding the failures of U.S. efforts to stop human trafficking. *Fordham Law Review*, 74 (6), 2977-3040.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objective and constructivist methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook on qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clawson, H. J., Small, K. M., Go, E. S., & Myles, B. W. (2003). Needs assessment for service providers and trafficking victims. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/202469.pdf>
- Coalition of Catholic organizations against human trafficking. (n.d.). Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <http://www.nccbuscc.org/mrs/traffickingweb3.shtml>
- Feingold, D. (2005). Human trafficking. *Foreign policy*, 150, 26-32.
- Getu, M. (2006). Human trafficking and development: The role of microfinance. *Transformation*, 23(3), 142-156.
- Gozdziak, E. M., & Collett, E. A. (2005). Research on human trafficking in North America: A review of literature. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 99-128.
- Hughes, D. (2000). The "Natasha" trade: The transnational shadow market of trafficking in women. *Journal of International Affairs*, 53(2), 1-18.
- Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (2005). On-line at [HSTC@State.gov](mailto:HSTC@State.gov).

- Konrad, H. (2002). Trafficking in human beings – The ugly face of Europe. *Helsinki Monitor*, 3, 260-271.
- Laczko, F. (2005). Data and research on human trafficking. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 5-16.
- McKelvey, T. (2004). Of human bondage. *American Prospect*, 15 (11), 17-20.
- Omelaniuk, I. (2005). Trafficking in Human Beings. United Nations Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development: New York. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/field/southafrica/reports/reg-issues/trafficking-human-beings.pdf>
- Raymond, J., D'Cunha, J., Dzuhaytin, S. R., Hynes, H. P., Rodriguez, Z. R., & Santos, A. (2002). A Comparative Study of Women Trafficked in the Migration Process: Patterns, Profiles, and Health Consequences of Sexual Exploitation in Five Countries. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/LHON-672EPJ/\\$FILE/Gender\\_Migration\\_CATW\\_2002.pdf?](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/LHON-672EPJ/$FILE/Gender_Migration_CATW_2002.pdf?)
- Richard, A. O. (1999). International Trafficking in Women to the United States: A Contemporary Manifestation of Slavery and Organized Crime. Center for the Study of Intelligence. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <https://www.cia.gov/csi/monograph/women/trafficking.pdf>
- Richards, K. (2004). The trafficking of migrant workers: What are the links between labor and trafficking and corruption? *International Migration*, 42(5), 147-166.
- Salt, J., & Stein, J. (1997). Migration as Business: The Case of human trafficking. *International Migration*, 35(4), 467-494.
- Soderlund, G. (2005). Running from the rescuers: New U.S. crusades against sex trafficking and the rhetoric of abolition. *NWSA Journal*, 17(3), 64-87.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- The Florida State University Center of Advancement of Human Rights. (2003). Florida responds to human trafficking. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <http://www.cahr.fsu.edu/the%20report.pdf>
- Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA): (Public Law 106-386). Retrieved November 15, 2006, from [http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/12feb20041500/edocket.access.gpo.gov/cfr\\_2004/julqtr/28cfr1100.25.htm](http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/12feb20041500/edocket.access.gpo.gov/cfr_2004/julqtr/28cfr1100.25.htm)
- Tyldum, G., & Brunovskis, A. (2005). Describing the unobserved: Methodological challenges in empirical studies on human trafficking. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 18-34.

- United Nations (2000). Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. New York. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from [http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final\\_documents\\_2/convention\\_%20traff\\_eng.pdf](http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention_%20traff_eng.pdf)
- U.S. Department of State. (2006). Trafficking in persons report. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from <http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2006/>



APPENDIX A  
Interview Protocol for Providers

1. What local trafficking data has been previously collected?
2. What resources and assistance are needed by victims of human trafficking?
3. What services are currently available for victims of human trafficking? Who provides these services? To what extent are these services accessible to victims and utilized by victims? To what extent are these services effective?
4. What gaps exist in the service delivery system?
5. What challenges do you face in identifying and recruiting victims of human trafficking?
6. What challenges do you face in coordinating and providing services to victims of human trafficking?
7. What resources and assistance are needed by service providers to improve services to victims of trafficking?
8. What best practices have been implemented by the CTCAHT?
9. What trainings have you been involved in? Describe the training and audience.
10. How effective are trainings?
11. What is the current membership of CTCAHT? How effective is the coalition in recruiting and retaining members?
12. How effective is the coalition's communication among members?
13. Tell me about a current success.
14. Is there anything you wish you had done differently?
15. From your perspective, what is the goal of the coalition? How well do you think the coalition is accomplishing this goal?
16. What are the coalition's goals for the future?
17. What progress has CTCAHT made since its inception? Have there been changes in policy and practice in the community response to victims of trafficking?
18. What policy recommendations can be made to improve services to victims of trafficking?

APPENDIX B  
Interview Protocol for  
Victims and Survivors of Human Trafficking

1. What services did you need initially? Were these services available? Were they helpful?
2. Were there services that were not helpful or not needed? Were there services or actions that were actually harmful to you or your situation?
3. What services do you currently need? Are these services available to you?
4. What makes it difficult for you to access the services you need?
5. What would make it easier for you to access needed services?
6. What helped you most during this process?
7. Would you change anything about the way services are provided to other victims of trafficking?
8. What was most challenging for you about this experience?
9. In your current situation, do you feel safe?
10. What are your hopes and plans for the future?

## APPENDIX C

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Conference on Human Trafficking - Tuesday, August 1, 2006 Participant Evaluation

#### **MORNING SESSION Title: Overview of Laws Governing Human Trafficking**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

#### **AFTERNOON SESSION - Law Enforcement OR Social Services (please circle one)**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

## **PANEL DISCUSSION**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

## **OVERALL**

What were the most useful aspects of Day 1 of the conference?

What were the least helpful aspects of Day 1 of the conference?

Additional comments:

## APPENDIX D

### **3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Conference on Human Trafficking - Wednesday, August 2, 2006 Participant Evaluation**

#### **MORNING SESSION - Law Enforcement OR Social Services (please circle one)**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

#### **AFTERNOON SESSION Title: Minor Victims of Trafficking**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

## **CASE STUDIES ACTIVITY**

1. How useful will this information be in your everyday work?

☐ Very useful   ☐ Moderately useful   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat useful   ☐ Not at all useful

2. How organized was the information?

☐ Very organized   ☐ Moderately organized   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat organized   ☐ Not organized

3. How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?

☐ Very well   ☐ Moderately well   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Somewhat well   ☐ Not well at all

4. Name three or more of the most useful topics discussed:

5. Name three or more topics that you would like to hear about but were not discussed:

Other comments:

## **OVERALL**

What were the most useful aspects of Day 2 of the conference?

What were the least helpful aspects of Day 2 of the conference?

Additional comments:

APPENDIX E  
Conference Evaluations 2006

How useful will this information be in your everyday work?						
		Very useful	moderately useful	neutral	somewhat useful	not useful at all
Day One	Morning Session Totals	39	26	5	9	8
	Law Enforcement Session	7	8	2	1	1
	Social Services Session	12	8	3	3	1
	Unspecified Session*	11	9	4	5	1
	Panel Session	16	12	2	3	2
Day Two	Law Enforcement Session	8	1	0	2	0
	Social Services Session	17	5	0	1	0
	Unspecified Session*	5	1	0	1	0
	Afternoon Session	18	12	4	3	0
	Case Study	14	8	1	1	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		147	90	21	29	13
<b>Percent of Responses per Question</b>		49%	30%	7%	10%	4%

How organized was the information?						
		Very organized	moderately organized	neutral	somewhat organized	not organized
Day One	Morning Session Totals	55	22	2	0	0
	Law Enforcement Session	12	5	2	0	0
	Social Services Session	19	4	1	2	1
	Unspecified Session*	18	8	2	2	0
	Panel Session	23	7	2	1	1
Day Two	Law Enforcement Session	11	0	0	0	0
	Social Services Session	19	3	0	1	0
	Unspecified Session*	6	0	0	1	0
	Afternoon Session	25	9	2	2	0
	Case Study	13	9	0	2	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		201	67	11	11	2
<b>Percent of Responses per Question</b>		69%	23%	4%	4%	1%

\* Unspecified session refers to individuals who did not specify what session they had attended.

How well did the presenter(s) know the subject?						
		Very well	moderately well	neutral	somewhat well	not well at all
Day One	Morning Session Totals	69	9	0	1	0
	Law Enforcement Session	12	5	0	2	0
	Social Services Session	23	2	1	0	0
	Unspecified Session*	18	6	4	1	1
	Panel Session	29	5	1	0	0
Day Two	Law Enforcement Session	11	0	0	0	0
	Social Services Session	23	0	0	0	0
	Unspecified Session*	6	0	0	1	0
	Afternoon Session	29	4	2	2	0
	Case Study	12	7	1	1	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		232	38	9	8	1
<b>Percent of Responses per Question</b>		81%	13%	3%	3%	0.3%

\* Unspecified session refers to individuals who did not specify what session they had attended.



APPENDIX F  
Client Satisfaction Survey

\*Note: this form has been condensed for the purposes of this publication. The survey will include more space for description by respondents.

**Purpose:** *Refugee Services of Texas, Inc.* needs your opinion about the services you received so we continue to improve the program where it is most needed. You are not obligated to participate in this survey. Name and identifying information will not be collected. Your responses will not in any way affect your ability to receive services from us.

**Instruction:** Please try to respond to each question as appropriate.

**A. Information about yourself: Put a cross (X) besides the appropriate choice.**

<p>1. Gender    <input type="checkbox"/> Male        <input type="checkbox"/> Female</p>	<p>2. Age    <input type="checkbox"/> 18 or below    <input type="checkbox"/> 18-34              <input type="checkbox"/> 35-49            <input type="checkbox"/> 50-64              <input type="checkbox"/> 65-Older</p>
<p>3. Do you speak English? <i>(Please circle the desired response)</i>    <b>Yes</b>    or    <b>No</b></p>	<p>4. Do you speak Spanish? <i>(Please circle the desired response)</i>    <b>Yes</b>    or    <b>No</b></p>
<p>5. How long have you been in the United States of America?              <input type="checkbox"/> 0-6 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 7-12 months              <input type="checkbox"/> 13-18 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 19 months or more</p>	<p>6. a. How long have you been working with Kate at Refugee Services of Texas (RST)?              <input type="checkbox"/> 0-6 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 7-12 months              <input type="checkbox"/> 13-18 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 19 months or more</p>
<p>6. b. How long have you been working with Refugee Services of Texas (RST)?              <input type="checkbox"/> 0-6 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 7-12 months              <input type="checkbox"/> 13-18 months    <input type="checkbox"/> 19 months or more</p>	<p>7. Was any family member/members trafficked with you? <i>(Please circle the desired response)</i>    <b>Yes</b>    or    <b>No</b></p>
<p>8. Do you know anybody (immediate family, relatives, friends and others) in the United States? <i>(Please circle the desired response)</i>    <b>Yes</b>    or    <b>No</b></p>	

## **B. PRE-CERTIFICATION PHASE (BEFORE RECEIVING THE WORK PERMIT)**

9. In the beginning, before receiving the work permit, how were the services that were provided to you?

a. Foods

*Describe your good and bad experiences using food cards?*

*Describe your good and bad experiences buying food you like?*

*Describe your good and bad experiences cooking the food you like?*

b. Transportation

*Describe how you learned about using the bus?*

c. Interpreter services:

d. Housing:

e. Medical services:

f. Did Kate give you information on emotional services (like counseling)? **(Please circle the desired response)**

**YES or NO**

*How was the experience for you?*

g. Did Kate give you information on English classes or ESL services? **(Please circle the desired response)**

**YES or NO**

*How was the experience for you?*

h. Describe your experiences with the law enforcement on your trafficking case?

i. Describe your experiences with the court cases?

j. Describe your experiences with your lawyer/attorney?

10. How were the services/trainings provided to you later, including your orientation to the daily life activities in United States? For example, using the bus, going HEB. **(Answer if applicable)**

11. What do you think were some of the challenges for you before receiving the work permit?

12. Did you find the process of receiving services difficult at any time? **(Circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

a. If **'YES'** what were some of the constraints?

b. If **'NO'** what were some of the positive/good things about the process?

13. Did you at anytime feel boredom and loneliness during the initial stage before receiving the work permit? **(Circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

a. If **'YES'** how?

b. If **'NO'** how?

14. Did you feel unsafe at any time? **(Circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

a. If **'YES'** why?

b. If **'NO'** why?

**C. POST-CERTIFICATION PHASE (AFTER RECEIVING THE WORK PERMIT)**

15. What services did you need to get ready for working?

a. Did you receive the services from RST? **(Please circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

b. Did you receive for anyone else? **(Please circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

c. If **'Yes'** from where?

16. What was good or most helpful about the services you received?

17. Overall, what were some problems while receiving services from RST?

18. a. Did you feel like you could talk to Kate? **(Circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

b. Did she understand what you were saying and what you needed? **(Circle the desired answer)**

**YES or NO**

19. Is there anything else you want to say?

**THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.**

***Your effort will help us provide better service to you all!***