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1. BACKGROUND

Since 2004, the U.S. Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) and the U.S. Bureau of Justice Administration (BJA) have funded 42 anti-trafficking task forces comprising federal, state, and local law enforcement and social service providers. Currently 20 task forces throughout the U.S. receive OVC/BJA funding.¹ The intent of these federally funded task forces is for social service and law enforcement agencies to work collaboratively to investigate and prosecute trafficking crimes, and to provide services to victims of trafficking. The OVC’s *Human Trafficking Task Force E-guide* stresses the importance of a collaborative approach by explaining that, “the power of a successful anti-human trafficking collaborative effort can transform the limitations of a singular agency or organization into a strong, strategic multidisciplinary team with substantially improved capacity to impact the problem.”²

Although consensus seemingly exists about the purpose and benefits of a collaborative approach to human trafficking, task forces face the challenge of operating with limited guidance about successful strategies. To date, no evaluations of the task forces have occurred.³ However, a review of the 42 federally funded task forces found that less than half of them could be classified as having accumulated high-quality data.⁴ Recognizing the need for more rigorous evaluation of the task forces, Kristina Rose, deputy director of the Office for Victims of Crimes, stated the following, “There is no evidence, scientific evidence, yet to show that this [task force] model is effective.”⁵ Rigorous evaluation of these anti-trafficking efforts is needed. However, because this type of evaluation has not yet occurred, formative work is necessary to develop robust protocols that can be used in wide-scale process or outcome evaluations.

As public awareness and concern about human trafficking increases, other task forces have been established throughout the United States without the financial support of OVC/BJA. OVC’s *Task Force E-Guide* states that task forces need to focus on identifying human trafficking, serving victims, and investigating and building cases. Likewise, task forces that receive OVC/BJA funding adhere to these core function. Some of the task forces that do not receive federal funding are identical in structure and goals compared to the OVC/BJA funded task forces. Others, however, use differing leadership structures and are less focused on investigation and prosecutorial efforts and instead prioritize training, technical assistance, increasing community awareness about human trafficking, addressing service gaps, and

---

¹ https://ovc.ncjrs.gov/humantrafficking/traffickingmatrix.html
² https://www.ovcttac.gov/taskforceguide/eguide/
changing business norms and practices. Although these task forces do not fit the criteria put forth by the *E-Guide*, they are equally important in anti-trafficking efforts\(^6\) and also require robust evaluations.

In March 2013, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee launched the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking to review current efforts to improve the City’s response to human trafficking and identify gaps in services for survivors. The creation of the Task Force was based on a recommendation made by the San Francisco Collaborative against Human Trafficking (SFCAHT). The Task Force includes partners from law enforcement, social services agencies, and community based organizations. The Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) staffs the Task Force. To date, the Task Force has not received federal funding.

The Task Force has bimonthly general meetings, and also subcommittee meetings. General meetings are held at City Hall, and subcommittee meetings at either City Hall or the DOSW office. The Task Force has the following subcommittees: Child Sex Trafficking, Labor Trafficking (formerly known as Illicit Massage Parlor), and Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact. A Super Bowl subcommittee was in existence until the completion of the sporting event in February of 2016. All meetings are chaired by Minouche Kandel of the DOSW.

---

The Researcher-Survivor-Ally Formative Evaluation of the San Francisco Mayor’s Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force has been undertaken to generate much-needed information about task force implementation and promising practices for identifying and responding to victims of trafficking. This study is unique and innovative in that the most integrated approach of community involvement is being utilized. People who have experienced a severe form of human trafficking are represented at all levels of the research process, including that of principal investigator, research assistants and members of the Community Advisory Board (CAB).

RTI International (RTI), in partnership with MD Consulting, was awarded a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct this study. Principal Investigators, Dr. Alexandra Lutnick and Ms. Minh Dang, each bring more than a decade of experience researching anti-trafficking initiatives throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Research assistants working on this study identify as survivors of human trafficking and bring additional experience working with survivors of human trafficking in direct service capacities.

NIJ provided RTI with funding for 3 years to conduct a process and outcome evaluation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking. With no existing evaluations of any anti-trafficking task force in the United States, this evaluation will not be able to compare the Mayor’s Task Force with findings from other evaluations.
2. METHODS

During this formative stage of the evaluation process, the evaluation team spent the first four months of the project learning about the Task Force and its members. Our efforts included reviewing historical documents, observing task force meetings, conducting in-depth interviews with Task Force members, and assessing levels of collaboration. The time and effort invested in these early activities have provided essential insights into the values and perspectives that shape the Task Force.

2.1 Historical Document Review

During the first three months of this evaluation, we reviewed all available meeting minutes (2013 – 2016) from the Task Force’s general and subcommittee meetings, as well as the annual reports from 2015 and 2016. The 2015 annual report represented 6 months of data from clients served in 2014. Aggregate data related to confirmed or suspected human trafficking cases handled by government social service agencies, law enforcement and community-based organizations were included. Nineteen agencies reported data for the 2015 report. The 2016 report was comprised of data gathered in 2015. Sixteen agencies provided data on confirmed human trafficking cases.

Since the Task Force’s inception in 2013, subcommittees have taken on specific tasks and projects. As part of our historical document review we read the following documents:

- The San Francisco Unified School District resolution, *In Support of Countering Human Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children*
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) drafted and signed by 11 agencies that delineated the goals and responsibilities related to working with commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC)
  - A CSEC Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) Flowchart that clarifies agency responsibilities and responses.
- The *No Traffick Ahead Awareness Campaign* for the 2016 Super Bowl
- The Sex Work & Trafficking Policy Impact subcommittee’s feedback on the human trafficking video created by Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST)
- The Sex Work & Trafficking Policy Impact subcommittee’s *Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy*
- Human Trafficking Media Guidelines to ensure that City departments consider the effects on human trafficking survivors before granting media access
2.2 Data Collection

2.2.1 Key Informant Interviews

To select interviewees, we used quota sampling to ensure representation of members from each subcommittee, newer members, long-standing members, key members (based on feedback provided by the DOSW), and people who had previous but not current involvement.

We contacted representatives from 27 agencies ranging from government social service providers, law enforcement and community-based organizations. From July through September 2016, 31 individuals from 25 agencies were interviewed (See Table 1).

The interview guide (See Appendix 1) used was created by the research team with input from their survivor-ally Community Advisory Board members. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and focused on the: a) organizational context of each agency; b) their involvement in the Task Force; c) actions of the Task Force and its goals; d) future plans and goals for the Task Force; and, e) perspectives on the evaluation. Agencies that provide direct services to people who have experienced trafficking, were also asked about clients who have experienced trafficking, and information about the referral process. During the interview with the DOSW, we asked specific questions about the implementation of the Task Force and its operations.

Each interview was audio recorded with the permission of the participants. We took note during the interviews and used the audio recordings afterwards to ensure the accuracy of information. We then e-mailed interviewees the interview notes and asked them to verify their accuracy. In some cases, interviewees requested changes. After making those changes we finalized the interview notes.

2.2.2 Levels of Collaboration

A diversity of organizations are coming together at the Task Force meetings to address human trafficking. The multiple service needs of people who have experienced trafficking make it unlikely that one system will be able to adequately address them all. For interagency task forces to be sustainable and effective, it is critical to have a functioning system of service coordination and interagency collaboration.

On August 24, 2016, at the general Task Force meeting, we administered the Levels of Collaboration Scale coupled with open-ended questions (see Appendix 2) that asked members to reflect upon current and desired levels of collaboration. The purpose of this scale and questions was to describe and assess collaboration among Task Force members, and engage Task Force members in dialogues about what promotes and inhibits collaborative efforts.
In deciding which agencies or individuals to include on the list, we reviewed all available meeting minutes from 2015 and 2016. If an organization/individual attended 2 or more meetings during that time period, we included them on the list. We created this inclusion criteria because attending at least two meetings is a minimum for collaboration to occur.

Of the 44 agencies/individuals listed on the scale, 20 were present at the August meeting and completed the scale and open-ended questions. Two agencies did not fill out the scale appropriately and were excluded from the data. Therefore, the data represents 18 agencies. Two agencies (Legal Aid Society – Employment Law Center; Robocop) that were not included on the list were present at this meeting and completed the scale and questions. For Robocop this was their first meeting. It was brought to our attention at the meeting that Legal Aid Society – Employment Law Center had attended previous meetings. Unfortunately we did not have the minutes from those meetings so were unaware of this. They will be included in future versions of the scale.

2.3 Data Analysis

The straightforward nature of the different data reviewed and collected allowed for simple descriptive methods to be used for analysis. For historical documents, we noted the key themes. For the in-depth interviews we summarized the notes by question and then compared and contrasted responses across all interviewees. We used this same approach for the open-ended questions administered with the levels of collaboration scale. Responses to the quantitative levels of collaboration scale were dual entered into excel, compared to one another, and flagged for discrepancies for review and correction.
Table 1: List of Agencies Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th># of Interviewees</th>
<th>Subcommittee Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APILO (Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women’s Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC, Sex Work, Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSWAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Prevention Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Human Services - Family &amp; Children Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health - Environmental Health Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health - Newcomers Health Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work, Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department on the Status of Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC, Sex Work, Labor, Super Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CSEC, Sex Work, Labor, Super Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Society - Employment Law Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYRIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUA (Mujeres Unidas y Activas)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender – Adult Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender – Juvenile Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeHouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Infirmary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sex Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Collaborative Against Human Trafficking (SFCAHT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC, Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD – Special Victims Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSEC, Sex Work, Labor, Super Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFUSD/Unaccompanied Immigrant Student Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSEC, Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHADE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner Truth Foster Family Service Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Super Bowl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. FINDINGS

3.1 Historical Documents

3.1.1 Meeting Minutes

A consistent system of note taking was not established at the earliest Task Force meeting. Due to the rotational nature of interns at DOSW (the primary note takers at many meetings), the style of minutes varied, making it difficult at times to determine what was discussed. Additionally, long delays in posting the minutes on the DOSW website prevents an up-to-date understanding of Task Force efforts for potential and current members, as well as the evaluation team.

Reviewing attendance and looking for trends was complicated by the reality that not all meeting minutes are posted on the website. All of the general meeting minutes, except for those from October 2016, were available. Over half of the minutes from each subcommittee were not available. Consequently, we are only able to talk about attendance trends from the general meetings.

Since 2013 the number of agencies attending the general meetings has grown (See Table 2), with 79 agencies or individuals attending at least one meeting. At the same time, 39 agencies have stopped attending meetings. Although the Task Force is overseen by the Mayor’s Office, no one from that office has attended any meetings thus far in 2016.

Table 2: General Meeting Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Agencies</th>
<th>Median # of Meetings Attended (range)*</th>
<th>Median # of People from Each Agency (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (1-5)</td>
<td>1 (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>37 (6 new, 9 gone)</td>
<td>3 (1-6)</td>
<td>2 (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39 (12 new, 14 gone, 3 returned)</td>
<td>2 (1-5)</td>
<td>1 (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40 (11 new, 16 gone, 3 returned)</td>
<td>2 (1-4)</td>
<td>1 (1-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that for 2015, meeting minutes were not available for one meeting. One set of meeting minutes was not available for 2016, and 2016 still has one meeting before the end of the year.
General Task Force Meetings

Discussions in 2013 began with exploring members’ suggestions to pursue federal funding for the Task Force. Members also reviewed projected goals and the Roadmap that was created by the DOSW, the Human Right’s Commission, Mayor’s Office, District Attorney (DA), San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the US Attorney General’s Office. The proposed San Francisco Task Force Governance Model stressed the importance of collaboration with community-based agencies. In the first year, conversations also focused on how best to avoid duplication of efforts by the Task Force and the San Francisco Collaborative Against Human Trafficking (SFCAHT). The delineation decided upon was that the Task Force’s main goal would be to push policies forward, while SFCAHT would remain responsible for public outreach. Data collection and examples of model data collection systems began, as well as the recognition for the need to know which agencies are training staff about human trafficking or are training other organizations about human trafficking.

As the Task Force moved into 2014, year 2, discussions began between the DOSW and the sex workers’ rights community related to the impact of anti-trafficking efforts. These conversations began as a result of sex workers protesting a panel held by SFCAHT and sponsored by the DOSW. The panel, entitled “Discouraging Demand,” was coupled with the 2014 Modern Day Abolitionist Award Ceremony, and included presentations about demand for prostitution, the First Offender Prostitution Program (John School), and efforts in Alameda County to reduce demand. Around the same time, but unrelated to the panel, SAGE, SFPD and the DOSW had received funding from Demand Abolition to implement end demand efforts in San Francisco. As a result of conversations with the coordinator for that grant, SAGE, the DOSW, SFPD, St. James Infirmary (SJI), Bay Area Sex Worker Advocacy Network (BAYSWAN), and other sex worker representatives, San Francisco decided to return the funding. These conversations also highlighted the shared goal of eliminating violence against sex workers and people involved in the sex industry (be it by choice, circumstances, or coercion).

In 2015, the DOSW presented data that was provided by agencies using the data tool created by the Task Force. The initial tool tracked type of trafficking, reporting agency, known and suspected victims, offenders, demographics and case processing. Subsequent discussions involved avoiding the duplication of figures without breaching confidentiality.

In 2016, THE DOSW presented the updated version of the data collection tool used to gather info on human trafficking cases. Suspected cases are no longer included.
**CSEC Subcommittee**

The creation of the CSEC subcommittee was driven by the desire to develop and create screening and assessment tools for use by agencies and departments in contact with commercially sexually exploited youth. Shelter space and appropriate housing for survivors was identified as a significant gap in service. Members also identified the need to create policies that do not penalize youth if they leave their housing placement.

Prior to 2013, many law enforcement and social service agencies followed policies which criminalized commercially sexually exploited youth. Since 2013, many agencies have shifted away from system involvement and criminalization of youth – instead referring youth to community partners to receive supportive services, rather than the previous policy that often led to CSEC survivors being placed in Juvenile Hall. Funding was secured for a 24-hour CSEC response run by Huckleberry Youth Services and services include emergency shelter and permanent housing. San Francisco Options for Youth (SF-OCAY), a collaboration between Asian Women’s Shelter, APILO, and LYRIC, was created to provide services to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth who are experiencing sex trafficking and in need of both short-term and long-term assistance. The funding for these two programs, the 24-hour response and SF-OCAY, did not come from the Task Force. However, because these were identified as needs by the Task Force, the DOSW and other members were able to secure this funding from the Mayor’s Office. For the 24-hour response, in the first year funding was requested it was not granted. In the second year, funding for a pilot program was secured. The third year saw full funding provided by the Mayor’s Office. Funding for SF-OCAY marks the first time the Mayor’s Office provided funding specifically for direct service provision to people experiencing trafficking.

**Sex Work & Trafficking Policy Impact Subcommittee**

In 2014, Alexandra Lutnick presented to the DOSW, SFPD and DA’s Office research findings from multiple studies conducted in San Francisco. The studies showed the prevalence of physical and sexual violence experienced by sex workers in San Francisco. The groups discussed concerns about criminal responses to trafficking and the collateral consequences of increasing danger for sex workers. The need to create a working group to minimize potential harm was identified.

The subcommittee wrote a critique of the POST video on human trafficking. This document was approved by the Task Force and submitted to Ralph Brown at POST. It was also shared with the wider anti-trafficking community, with agencies such as CAST (Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking) sending it to their list serve members.

This subcommittee in collaboration with the DOSW, San Francisco DA’s Office, Public Defender’s Office, and the SFPD developed the Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers policy.
The DA’s Office approved this policy July 1, 2015. The tandem policy for use by the SFPD is still pending approval.

Based on conversations within this subcommittee, the DOSW provided funding in 2015 to the SJI for a Bad Date List. This list allows people involved in sex work to notify one another of violent, dangerous, or harmful people to reduce the likelihood of another bad encounter in our community. The DOSW also provided funding to the SJI to create a training video for the Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy.

**Labor Subcommittee**

The Labor subcommittee, initially named the Illicit Massage Parlor subcommittee, was created to address the possibility of trafficking in massage establishments. The subcommittee discussed the creation of victim-centered approaches to investigations by the DPH and SFPD. To date, DPH has hired bilingual health outreach workers and provided referrals to massage therapists requesting connections to social service providers. The DOSW noted that it was the work of the Task Force that assisted DPH in seeing the need for bilingual health outreach workers who are not connected with law enforcement. Prior to the establishment of these two positions, DPH relied on volunteers to do the translation work during massage establishment inspections. Supervisor Tang assisted in securing this funding, a need that was identified during the initial Illicit Massage Parlor subcommittee meetings.

The subcommittee discussed how legal service organizations in the Bay Area that provide services to people who have experienced trafficking do not receive many cases originating from massage parlors. Instead, subcommittee members feel that labor exploitation is more prevalent in construction, restaurant, domestic work and home health care industries. As one interviewee during our formative interviews commented, “The majority of trafficking cases are from labor sectors outside of sex work. The most common sectors of labor trafficking are occurring with drug muling and cultivation/sales of drugs, restaurant labor, in the construction industry and within large hotel and restaurant chains.” Similarly, the International Labor Organization’s 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labor indicated that worldwide, labor trafficking is over three-and-a-half times as prevalent as sex trafficking.7

The Labor Subcommittee has begun to address and explore other forms of labor exploitation. One example is focusing on unaccompanied minors who are forced to sell drugs. Rather than being looked at by law enforcement as a form of victimization, undocumented youth who are forced to engage in illegal activity are often arrested and prosecuted. Another example is the Healthy Nails program run by the San Francisco Department of the Environment. The goal of this program is to reduce exposure of nail salon workers.

---

employees and residents to the toxic chemicals in nail products. Members of the Task Force are in the process of developing curriculum to include in this program that will address labor rights and trafficking. This program technically focuses on all nail technicians, but is presented in Vietnamese because of the over-representation of Vietnamese speaking nail technicians.

**Super Bowl Subcommittee**

The Super Bowl subcommittee was created to leverage the attention the city would have during the sporting event to raise awareness about trafficking and conduct trainings. The DOSW partnered with the host committee and attended the monthly regional collaboration meetings in San Jose. As part of this collaborative work, resolutions were signed by twenty-five cities and counties, including San Francisco, to encourage hotels and restaurants to train employees, assess their supply chains for trafficking, and adopt codes of conduct. These resolutions highlighted how cities would not host events at hotels and restaurants unless their staff had been trained and their supply chains examined. In collaboration with the subcommittee, the No Traffick Ahead campaign was created. Posters were placed in visible locations throughout San Francisco with the goal of educating the greater community about human trafficking. Stanford is nearing completion of a free, online training about trafficking geared towards hospitality workers and the general public. Based on the work in San Francisco, the DOSW created a tool kit of their Super Bowl efforts, and is sharing that with other cities as a model that can be replicated. No impact evaluation was conducted on these efforts related to the Super Bowl.

**3.1.2 Annual Reports**

The Task Force published its first annual report in 2015. Of the 41 agencies listed as members of the Task Force, 19 contributed data to the report. A review of the agencies by the evaluation team showed that a total of 29 agencies interact with people who may have experienced trafficking and thus could have reported data. The data represented the last 6 months of 2014. Several key limitations of the data need to be noted:

1) The data are duplicated (meaning a person could be counted more than once if they crossed several agencies);

2) The numbers reported included suspected and known trafficking cases.

3) Agencies did not receive clear guidance on when to include someone in the suspected category. Unfortunately this means that agencies reporting data were not using the same definitions to assess whether someone had experienced trafficking or were suspected to have experienced it. The report acknowledges
these limitations and suggests that for the following year the Task Force would benefit from using a systematic screening tool and ensuring agencies consistently use the same definitions of human trafficking (i.e. those set forth in the TVPA).

4) Knowing that trafficking outside of the sex industry comprises the majority of labor trafficking, the report also highlights the underrepresentation of those cases in the agency data. It suggests that increasing efforts and resources to identify and serve people who have experienced those forms of labor exploitation are needed.

5) Sixty-six percent (19 out of 29) Task Force members provided data for this report. The report does not describe how agencies self-selected, were chosen or required to submit data. It remains unclear if barriers exist that prevent agencies from being willing or able to submit data.

In January 2016, the evaluation team reviewed the data collection tool used for the 2015 report and we made several recommendations:

1) **Work towards having an unduplicated count across reporting agencies.**

2) **Remove suspected trafficking from data collection tool.** No consistent guidance is given on how to assess for suspected status. For example, all youth who are child welfare involved could be considered suspected. With such a large inclusion, the number becomes meaningless.

3) **Be consistent with gender and biological sex descriptors.** The report uses both biological sex (male, female) and gender (woman, man). Best practice is to use the following inclusive gender categories: cisgender women, cisgender men, transgender women, transgender men, genderqueer.

4) **Include detailed types of labor trafficking.** Instead of just listing labor trafficking as the category, include the various industries where people are experiencing exploitation. That way the Task Force will have a better idea of which industries are most problematic in San Francisco (i.e. agriculture; in-home domestic care; fishing; hospitality industries; factory/manufacturing; drug sales; begging/panhandling; other).

5) **Collect more detailed information from criminal justice agencies.** Task forces that receive DOJ funding are required to capture the following data: a) Number of cases investigated, by type of trafficking and immigration status; b) Percentage of investigations that result in an arrest, by type and immigration status; c) Number of
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suspects charged, by type of trafficking; d) Number of cases prosecuted, by type of prosecution; and, e) Number of confirmed trafficked persons, by type of trafficking. Collecting this data will prime the Task Force to receive federal funding if it pursues another grant proposal issued by the DOJ. Regardless of whether or not funding possibilities are attached, collecting this information is important because it can inform San Francisco’s response.

6) Explore ways to get more agencies reporting data and also more complete data submitted by agencies. With less than half of Task Force members submitting data, and those submitting data largely not providing complete data, the Task Force would benefit from having conversations about the reasons why people do or do not submit data as well as why incomplete data is submitted. It is also worth exploring whether reporting a year’s worth of data at one time is contributing to the lack of involvement and incomplete data.

In 2016, the Task Force issued its second annual report. This report includes data from the entirety of 2015. Having a full year’s worth of data is an improvement over the previous year’s report. Similarly, removing the suspected trafficking category from the data collection form allowed for a greater likelihood that the severe form of human trafficking definition was used to assess whether someone experienced trafficking. Including more detailed categories about the types of labor trafficking people are experiencing was a helpful addition to the data collection tool. This has the potential to focus San Francisco’s efforts on the most widely reported labor sectors where people are experiencing exploitation. Of the 49 agencies listed as members of the Task Force, 15 contributed data to the report. A review of the agencies by the evaluation team showed that a total of 34 agencies interact with people who may have experienced trafficking and thus could have reported data.

Several key limitations of the data from the 2016 report need to be noted:

1) Similar to the 2015 report, the data are still duplicated.

2) Although guidance was given to use the TVPA definition for a severe form of human trafficking, some reporting agencies indicated that at times they are still subjectively determining whether to include someone in the count. This highlights the importance of returning to the suggestion made in the 2015 report to have a screening tool that is used by agencies reporting data.

3) The report highlights how the Task Force recognizes that trafficking outside of the sex industry is likely still under-represented. Although the Task Force worked in 2015 to expand its focus on other forms of labor trafficking, the report acknowledges that it needs to continue these efforts.
4) Forty-four percent (15 out of 34) Task Force members provided data for this report. Even fewer Task Force members contributed data to the 2016 report compared to the one from 2015 (44% vs 69%).

In August 2016, the evaluation team reviewed the data collection tool used for the 2016 report and made several recommendations:

1) **Work towards having an unduplicated count across reporting agencies.**

2) **Be consistent with gender and biological sex descriptors.** The report continues to use both biological sex (male, female) and gender (woman, man).

3) **Remind agencies about the importance of confidentiality when sharing case profiles.** In a draft version of the 2016 report, multiple case profiles shared information that could be linked back to an individual. In one such situation, the profile was of someone who is currently involved in a pending legal case. If that was not caught before the report was published, it could have compromised the legal case.

4) **Ask for details about how trainings are evaluated.** Knowing the number of trainings conducted is important. Equally important is knowing the impact of those trainings.

5) **Explore ways to get more agencies reporting data and more complete data submitted by agencies.** 2016 saw even fewer agencies submit data, and the issues with incomplete data submission remain.

6) **Hire a data analyst.** It is possible that if the Task Force had a data analyst available, they could overcome some of the challenges with data collection, analysis and reporting. It is less than ideal to rely on the person who staffs the Task Force (a 50% FTE position), coupled with student interns, to manage this task. Their limited time availability and quantitative analysis skills may prevent the data collection and analysis from being as methodologically rigorous as is needed.

### 3.2 Interviews with Task Force Members

#### 3.2.1 Agency’s Trafficking Work

**Amount of Time Focused on Trafficking**

Interviewees reported that their agencies began focusing on trafficking as recently as the past year and as long back as the inception of their agencies (for some this goes back many
decades). For those with the longest involvement, they highlighted how their work with people experiencing exploitation in various labor sectors pre-dates the introduction of the term trafficking.

**Survivor Presence at Agency**

The majority of agencies (17/24) do not have or are not aware of people who have experienced trafficking working at their agencies. Those who are unaware cite human resource hiring regulations that prevent asking about that type of personal information in the interview process. They also cite co-workers not self-disclosing this personal information. Seven of the agencies do have people who have experienced trafficking working at their agencies. Many pointed out that people who fit the definition of a severe form of human trafficking do not identify with the term trafficking survivor or victim. Among those agencies with staff members who have experienced trafficking, three reported that these individuals are represented at all levels. This highlights that creative workarounds exist to prioritize people with lived experiences in the hiring process. For fear that it may lead to non-consensual identification of staff members, many of these agencies did not disclose the number of staff who fit the definition. Consequently, the number of paid peer staff ranged from an undisclosed number to nine. A couple of agencies reported that they have had people who experienced trafficking as interns. Compared to agencies that have people who have experienced trafficking in paid positions, those who have survivors as interns shared a lot of personal, identifying information about those individuals.

Regardless of whether or not agencies have people who have experienced trafficking currently on staff, most were in agreement that having such people would be helpful. However, people highlighted a number of criteria that would need to be met. Individuals would need to meet other job requirements (i.e. experience, education, licensing requirements, and background checks) and could not be hired solely because of their trafficking experiences. Agencies would need to think carefully about how to meaningfully and appropriately involve these individuals. Agencies do not want to re-traumatize or exploit people, do not want to see them only as their trauma, and would want to ensure that appropriate levels of professional development and support are provided such that people can assume paid positions, including at the leadership level. Three agencies interviewed felt that it was not necessary to have survivors as paid staff at their agencies. For some this is because the trafficking work they do is a very small percentage of their overall work. For others it is because they partner with other agencies that have survivor representation and felt that was sufficient.
Percentage of Clients Who Have Experienced Trafficking

Not all those interviewed provide direct services. Among those that do, some were not able to report what percentage of their case load was comprised of people who have experienced trafficking. For those who did know the case breakdown, trafficking makes up a small portion of their work. In general, clients who have experienced trafficking comprise only 2-25% of an agency’s work. For those working with this population, they described how they are working with youth, adults, foreign nationals, and citizens. Overwhelmingly, interviewees described exploitation happening in the following labor sectors: hospitality (i.e. restaurants and hotels), construction, fishing, agriculture, domestic care (i.e. childcare (nanny/au pair), elder care, house cleaning, landscaping), nursing homes, and the sex industry.

A number of interviewees emphasized the problematic nature of terms used to talk about trafficking. Some stressed the importance of eliminating the false divide between labor and sex trafficking. They highlighted that sex work is a type of work and, like all other labor sectors, the sex industry also sees exploitation, trafficking and wage theft. For others, it is the challenge that comes with translation to other languages. In Spanish the word for trafficking, “trata”, means sex and drug trafficking. Consequently, when this term is used in outreach and education efforts, people who may be experiencing exploitation in other labor sectors will not relate to what is being said and consequently are resistant to applying that term to their experience.

How Clients Are Identified

Agencies primarily learn about clients’ trafficking experiences through referring agencies, outreach efforts, or reports/tips they receive from others (including the National Human Trafficking Hotline). In situations where agencies did not know about a client’s trafficking experiences from the outset, interviewees described how over time those people will disclose aspects of their lived experiences that fit the trafficking definition. For those involved in the criminal justice system, their trafficking experiences come up when they are charged with trafficking related offenses or when they are a victim in a case. Sometimes labor trafficking clients are identified through the U-visa process. In some cases, clients self-identify, but that is extremely rare. It is rare that people self-identify as having experienced trafficking.

Service Needs

Across interviewees, the two most mentioned needs were housing (both short and long term options) and viable employment options. Other immediate safety needs mentioned included getting out of violent relationships, access to health care (physical, mental, sexual), substance use treatment, family reunification, and food. A number of legal services needs
were also routinely addressed. These included civil remedies, immigration issues, dealing with outstanding warrants, record expungement, emancipation of minors, and reentry services for those coming out of jail or prison.

3.2.2 Involvement on Task Force

Length of Time for Agency and Individual

The range of time that agencies and individuals have been involved range from the inception of the Task Force in 2013 to within the past year. The majority of agencies interviewed (n=12) reported involvement since the beginning. It’s important to note that several people interviewed shared that their agencies are not members of the Task Force; instead, they attend on an individual basis. Their agencies, however, are listed as members in Task Force materials.

A number of people interviewed shared that they only attend subcommittee meetings. This is primarily because they find the general meeting and some of the other subcommittee meetings to be “hostile,” “aggressive,” and “unwelcoming” spaces that provide little space for differing perspectives.

Role

When asked what their role is on the Task Force, people overwhelmingly shared that it is to attend meetings, share information about their agencies, represent their clients’ perspectives, and network. It was rare that people described roles that involved Task Force related tasks, although a few did mention that their role is to work on policy issues and share subcommittee related information at the general meetings.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

The Task Force does not have an MOU with any agency or Task Force member. Interestingly, five of the interviewees reported that they did have an MOU in place. This could be because they had an MOU prior to the Mayor’s Office taking the lead over the Task Force. It could also be that they have an MOU in place with the DOSW for work funded by one of their grants.

Communication with Other Task Force Members

The frequency and styles of communication outside of Task Force meetings varies. Most people who responded to this question described daily interactions with other Task Force members. It is important to note that the interactions they described were not related to Task Force specific needs, but rather their agency’s work. Others described that communication such as emails, calls, and meetings take place on an as needed basis and
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primarily among subcommittee members. A few people noted that conversations among Task Force members are more transparent when the DOSW staff are not involved.

**Maintenance of Client Confidentiality**

In general, specific cases are not talked about during Task Force meetings. As a result, client confidentiality measures are not required. Most of those interviewed shared that if they were to speak about specific clients, they would need a release of information and other requisite forms such as HIPPAA.

**Involvement in Federal Trafficking Cases**

The majority of people interviewed had no involvement with federal trafficking cases. Among non-law enforcement agencies that were previously involved in a federal case (n=5), the dynamics of their experiences varied. Three of the five characterized the experiences as problematic. In one case, it was because a client was being charged as a trafficker and that charge seemed to be based on limited understanding of immigrant communities and the issues they face. In the other two cases, interviewees reported that attorneys spoke despairingly about their clients who were survivors, and in one case threatened to incarcerate the client because they did not want to testify. Those interviewed who represent law enforcement shared that it is very difficult to bring a federal case because of the legal standards of proof required. Sometimes local law enforcement will present a case to federal agents to see if they want to take it. Other times federal agents will let local law enforcement know that a case will not work at the federal level but has a chance of success at the state level.

3.2.3 **Task Force in Action**

**Strengths & Successes**

Those interviewed shared a number of Task Force strengths (see Appendix 3 for successes identified in the Task Force Annual Reports). They mentioned the importance of having a space to develop advocacy strategies and collect data about clients being served who have experienced trafficking. Many reported that having a diverse membership of agencies and individuals is very important. With this diversity comes opportunities to network, share resources, and facilitate connections that may not otherwise happen. Similarly, many noted that having law enforcement and community providers share the table is a key strength of the Task Force. At the same time, people indicated that not having the Task Force staffed by law enforcement is a strength because it allows for a more holistic response to human trafficking.
Numerous people highlighted the importance that the Task Force is convened by the Mayor and staffed by the DOSW. Having the Mayor’s endorsement gives the Task Force a sense of “importance and urgency” and staffing by the DOSW offers the skilled leadership and facilitation of Minouche Kandel. An additional strength of having the Mayor’s endorsement is it creates a greater likelihood that city funding may be available when key needs are addressed or that suggested curriculum will be implemented. Two such examples are the funding provided for the 24-hour CSEC response and the resolution that human trafficking be included in curriculum for middle and high school students. The SFUSD resolution was informed by Task Force work. Although it now exists outside of the Task Force, as do other identified successes such as the 24-hour response and SF-OCAY, it appears that the formative work of the Task Force created a path of success for these programs.

Some of the interviewees spoke directly about the work of specific subcommittees. Seven agencies highlighted the importance of the Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact subcommittee, while six talked about the work of the Super Bowl subcommittee. Many people felt it was important and unique that sex workers are part of the Task Force. The feedback document about the human trafficking training created by POST and the Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers policy were two products that people felt were important to the work of the Task Force. For those who mentioned the Super Bowl subcommittee’s work, they spoke to how they felt the public awareness campaign was important and how they appreciated that the advertisements focused on labor trafficking more broadly and did not recreate a lot of the problematic images used in many anti-trafficking campaigns.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

The most mentioned area from improvement was related to representation of diverse communities and the focus of the Task Force’s anti-trafficking efforts. Interviewees reflected that Task Force meetings are dominated by cisgender women and the absence of youth, immigrants, and other genders is problematic. Because the space is used for networking and, in some instances, advocating for funding, interviewees noted that some agencies purposefully misrepresent the work they do, their relationships with community partners, and the extent to which they focus on trafficking. Interviewees also raised the concern that little attention is focused on preventing trafficking (all the responses seem to be after trafficking has already occurred) or on exploitation in labor sectors other than the sex industry or gendered spaces like nail salons and massage establishments. Some attribute this limited representation of community members and scope of work to the fact that the Task Force is staffed by the DOSW and their philosophical orientation and mission dominate the work.

In terms of past or ongoing Task Force efforts, those interviewed addressed several areas for improvement. A number of interviewees talked about how it is unclear how membership
or subcommittees are established. As mentioned earlier, a number of people do not consider their agencies to be members, yet they are listed as such. Also, members of the Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact Subcommittee shared that no formal conversations took place about being a subcommittee of the Task Force. It was only when they saw their committee listed that they were aware it had happened. Similarly, some agencies contributed data to the Annual Report but were not listed as Task Force members. For example, the Adult Probation Department contributed data to the 2015 Annual Report, but is not listed as a member of the Task Force. The same is true for Mujeres Unidas y Activas (MUA). They contributed data to the 2016 Annual Report, but are not listed as a member.

Although most people interviewed want data to be collected in some fashion, many detailed how the current data lacks substance and is limited by duplication and agencies not participating because of confidentiality concerns. A number of agencies that work with youth mentioned that the poster campaign does not resonate with the young people they work with, and instead evokes misguided “stranger danger” approaches to complex social issues. Similarly, interviewees shared that the Task Force’s products and deliverables are not relevant to those directly impacted by exploitation; it’s “a lot of media and not a lot of tangibles.” One interviewee highlighted how they felt the Task Force was a “misuse of time” because, “you have all these people who could influence policy and spend meetings watching things or dissecting things.”

Although many people highlighted the array of members as a strength, they also highlighted how the lack of formal procedures and guidelines for the Task Force is a barrier to the work. With a diversity of agencies represented, people stressed the importance of having a strategic plan that clearly describes the priorities of the Task Force. Without such guidance, members noted that people often move meetings in their preferred direction, and use meeting time to serve their own agenda without listening or participating. As one interviewee shared, “The people who speak loudest get heard...others don’t feel like space is there for them to speak.” Others mentioned how the subcommittees feel like autonomous meetings and currently the Task Force does not have a mechanism to link all of the work. Without a strategic plan to help guide the work and conversations it is, “hard to do good work.”

Another challenge that comes with such a diverse membership is the ways in which differing philosophies and orientations create tension. This was mentioned most frequently in relation to the law enforcement/community-based agency divide, and the presence of the Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact Subcommittee. Both law enforcement and community-based agencies and individuals noted the divide that exists at meetings between the two groups. Both feel “bullied” by the other. At the same time, many community-based organizations stressed that the level of law enforcement presence at the meetings feels restrictive to active involvement of community members who are most impacted by the actions of the
Task Force. In regard to the Sex Work subcommittee, both members and non-members of that subcommittee mentioned that it feels disconnected from the larger Task Force, with some Task Force members not even aware that it exists. Members of the subcommittee want to see the Task Force open to a more complex narrative about people in the sex trades, one that affirms their rights and highlights the ways in which the End Demand movement is wrapped up in stigma, shame and morality. Numerous members who are not a part of that subcommittee indicated that nothing would ever convince them that someone would choose to sell sex and the best response is to target clients and detain young people for their safety. These two divides, those between law enforcement and community providers, and also those between the Sex Work subcommittee and some of the other members, highlight the challenges when no common language is shared. This is heightened by what some interviewees felt was a facilitation style that does not allow for people to continue conversations when real differences come up. Instead an “agree to disagree” approach is used.

Although numerous agencies highlighted the success of the Super Bowl campaign, an equal number shared their critiques and concerns. Many spoke to the collateral consequences that such campaigns often cause. A key concern was that outreach such as the posters can increase surveillance of communities that are already heavily surveyed, leading to an increase in criminalization. Another concern was that the No Traffick Ahead map that indicates which businesses received human trafficking training provides no information about the reliability or validity of the curriculum used and also does not indicate whether those businesses are exemplars of good labor practices and policies. Overall, interviewees who critiqued the Super Bowl efforts felt that the subcommittee’s work was neither informed by nor involved active, meaningful participation from key community members (i.e. janitors, nail salon technicians, teens, sex workers, and hospitality industry workers).

**Public Engagement**

Approximately half of the people interviewed could not offer examples of how the Task Force interacts with or engages the public. Some even shared that they, “don’t think most of the public knows about the Task Force.” The other half pointed to media campaigns, the annual reports and online availability of meeting minutes. One interviewee noted that the Task Force unofficially divides up work with SFCAHT who does more of the public outreach and training, so that person felt it was not the role of the Task Force to focus on public engagement.

**Promotion of Agencies or Events**

Similar to public engagement, most people did not know how the Task Force decides which agencies or events to promote. Among those who offered their perspectives, some felt that
it was decided by the DOSW, others that it was decided by Task Force members, and still some thought it was based on priority. A couple interviewees shared they thought that Minouche simply forwards to the e-mail list any information a Task Force member sends to her. A few also noted that it is likely political; that the Task Force would only promote agencies or events that are supported by the Mayor.

3.2.4 Task Force Goals

Over one-third of the interviewees did not know what the goals of the Task Force were. The rest of the interviewees gave responses related to eradicating human trafficking and improving San Francisco’s response to the issue. Overwhelmingly, the specifics of how to achieve this were not specified and when they were they did not focus on upstream approaches that would prevent trafficking and exploitation from occurring in the first place. Instead the goals were situated around what to do once trafficking had occurred. These included public awareness and education, increasing agency capacity to identify and serve people who have experienced trafficking, gathering data, identifying gaps in services, and increasing collaboration between city and community agencies. One person mentioned that in 2013, prior to the DOSW staffing, a strategic plan was developed and detailed in the City and County of San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force Road Map (See Appendix 4). That road map detailed goals and how to reach them, but as the Task Force grew that document was forgotten about.

Goal Identification and Measurement

Sixty percent of agencies interviewed (15/25) did not know how goals were identified by the Task Force. The remaining 10 agencies offered an array of responses. Some felt they were identified during discussion about the annual report, others that they are set by the DOSW and Mayor’s Office, and a few felt they were created at the subcommittee level.

When people don’t know the goals it is not possible for them to know how they are measured or if they are being achieved. Of the 10 agencies that shared what they thought the goals were, half indicated that no mechanisms were in place to measure outcomes. As one person reflected, “We don’t know what we’re actually doing.” The other 5 agencies felt that outcomes were being measured at the agency level and that data was shared in the annual report. However, some interviewees raised the point that this agency-level data does not represent Task Force efforts, but the Task Force and Mayor’s Office take credit for it even when they provided no financial support to the agencies for this work.

Challenges in Achieving Goals

In addition to the previously mentioned challenge that people did not know what the goals were, other interviewees thought that the Task Force was not set up to measure outcomes,
and some had specific ideas about what prevents the Task Force from achieving its goals. A number of people addressed the ways in which the slow-moving pace of government work can be a barrier. In some situations, it is staff turnover that lengthens the process. For example, since the inception of the Task Force, the Captain for Special Victims Unit (SVU) at SFPD changed four times. With each change in leadership, the policy and programmatic work the Task Force was doing with SVU was set back and took much longer to achieve. One member spoke to the frustrations of these delays, “If someone asked you what you would want to do if you had two-and-a-half years to work on policy and which policy would you choose, I’m not sure what we’ve passed so far would have been it.” A few interviewees thought that it was not just the slow process of government work that prevented goals from being achieved, but also the reality that the Task Force does not have a unified vision and common language for anti-trafficking efforts. Others highlighted how just because a policy or program has been implemented it is not necessarily indicative that the goal has been achieved. These people stressed the importance of assessing the impact of those responses. Some felt it was the limited funding for agency work and absences of short- and long-term housing options for people who have experienced trafficking that is the key barrier. Many of those interviewed felt the key barrier is the limited representation on the Task Force of members from affected communities. These people felt that the Task Force will never be successful without the input of young people, people of color, foreign nationals, undocumented immigrants, and non-English speaking individuals.

**Suggestions for Moving Forward with Goals**

Overwhelmingly, interviewees felt the best way to proceed would be to bring in a skilled facilitator to assist with strategic planning. This person, they hoped, would move the Task Force closer to having a unified vision and shared language. Others want to see a shift from post-trafficking responses to addressing macro-level issues that create vulnerability. Some think the data collection tool, if improved, could better track what is being done and where the gaps are. A number of interviewees who stressed the importance of having affected community members taking an active, meaningful role on the Task Force indicated that the best way to achieve this would be to ensure those people receive financial compensation for their involvement. Lastly, many interviewees spoke to what their individual agencies need to do to achieve goals as opposed to what the Task Force needs to do. This highlights the uncertainty many Task Force members have about what is Task Force work and what is agency work.

**3.2.5 Future Directions**

A number of those interviewed would like to see more defined roles on the Task Force and for more tangible outcomes. Stronger facilitation, action related outcomes and more client-centered approaches were identified as areas to discuss in future strategic planning
sessions. A commitment to collaboration, openness, flexibility, group goals and objectives will assist in moving things forward to ensure survivors’ needs are being met.

Numerous interviewees mentioned the need to create a broader focus on labor exploitation, but stated that this work has yet to happen. One recommendation was to increase involvement of the Office of Labor and Standards Enforcement (OLSE) on the Task Force. Continuing to do outreach and education with the general public and creating more interest in membership was also suggested. Additionally, finalizing the work with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) to implement campaigns and curriculum on healthy boundaries was recommended to ensure that all forms of human trafficking are addressed among younger populations.

Ascertaining how survivors feel about their interactions with different agencies and the services they receive, utilizing philosophies of self-determination and autonomy and a strategic plan based on community input will assist in working towards creating a climate where people can attend the Task Force meetings with a greater level of comfort. Unity and effort around all forms of trafficking and recognizing the needs of queer, immigrant and marginalized communities are ways people can be involved while feeling their boundaries are being acknowledged and their barriers to receiving services are being addressed. Increasing the diversity of people on the Task Force, continually reaching out to new members and discussing ways to include youth and survivor voices in meaningful and trauma-informed ways and increasing models based on harm reduction philosophies were identified by interviewees as desired outcomes.

Many people highlighted how the law enforcement presence at the Task Force is a key barrier to participation. A greater understanding of survivors, the roles social service providers play and addressing police perpetrated sexual assault have been identified as areas of improvement for the SFPD and SFDA’s Office. Finalizing and training law enforcement and prosecutors on the Safety for Sex Workers policy was mentioned numerous times as a way to work towards addressing these issues.

Developing resources and information for Spanish speaking communities, changing policies to allow survivors to receive benefits for longer periods of time, not having to constantly renew benefits, and creating more services for male survivors were expressed as future policies to address. Better articulating immigration policies, wage theft violations and civil remedies could be accomplished through increased interagency collaboration and aligning the methods used to identify victims of trafficking.
3.3 Levels of Collaboration

3.3.1 Quantitative

Twenty of the forty-four agencies listed were present and completed the Levels of Collaboration Scale. See Appendix 5 for a list of agencies that were included on the scale but were absent from the meeting. Two agencies did not fill out the scale appropriately and were excluded from the data. Therefore, the data represents 18 agencies. In this first administration of the Levels of Collaboration Scale we mistakenly listed SFCAHT and NCJW together. These are two separate agencies and in future administration of the scale they will be listed separately.

Overall the median score was 1, networking (see Table 3 for results from the scale). This means that the agency is aware of the other organization, has loosely defined roles, little communication with the other agency, and all decisions are made independently.

The highest median score received by an agency was 3, coordination. This is associated with sharing information and resources with each other, having defined roles, frequent communication, and some shared decision-making. The following agencies received this score: District Attorney’s Office – Victims Services, The DOSW, SFPD, and SFPD – SVU.

Some agencies consistently over- or under-rated their level of collaboration with others. The top over-raters were: the DOSW (76%); Nalls Foundation (76%), SFPD – SVU (65%), JaMel Perkins (65%), and SFCAHT (59%). The top under-raters were: SHADE (77%), Huckleberry (53%), APILO (47%), RTI International (47%) and Dignity Health (47%). The agency with the most exact ratings was the California Massage Therapy Counsel (59%).

3.3.2 Qualitative

Barriers to Collaboration

Collaborative projects take time and resources. Respondents indicated that without funding to support new collaborative efforts, their agencies likely would not have the capacity to take on such endeavors. A group of respondents noted that the large size of the Task Force makes it challenging to connect with other members. The distrust between some agencies negatively impacts other members on the Task Force. Respondents wrote how many clients are afraid to work with law enforcement due to concerns around immigration and "past bad acts" on the part of police officers. Acknowledging these challenges through strategic planning, education and formal MOUs for participation will allow Task Force members to
### Table 3: Levels of Collaboration Scale Results (N=18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Overrated</th>
<th>underrated</th>
<th>Exact Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Cannons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APILO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women’s Shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSWAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Massage Therapy Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse and Prevention Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney - Victim Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOSW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH - Newcomers Health Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Department of Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Children's Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JaMel Perkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services for Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Never Fails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALLS Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not For Sale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Labor Standards Enforcement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeHouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCAHT/NCJW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFMTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD – SVU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHADE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Mercy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner Truth Family Foster Youth Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Infirmary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Medical Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Tang’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US PROStitutes Collective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
move towards accomplishing goals. An additional full-time staff person at DOSW was identified as one way the Task Force can become more effective in accomplishing goals. Although many would like unduplicated data, they highlight that until safe guards are in place to protect confidentiality they do not feel comfortable providing more data.

**Increasing Collaboration**

Many respondents identified that because of attending Task Force meetings their agencies have built relationships with other service providers. In regard to how to further increase collaboration, many indicated that they would like an explanation of why participating is beneficial and how leadership roles are chosen. Collaborative grant writing was identified as a way to create sustainable services.

**Increasing Services for Survivors**

Increased staffing for wraparound case management, more safe housing and drop-in centers, and increased training on trauma-informed care were listed as areas for immediate improvement. Respondents also cited needs such as mentorship for survivors, addressing the impact of trafficking on communities of color, including survivors in policy creation and better addressing issues specific to transgender individuals who have experienced trafficking are needed.

**Future of the Task Force**

Developing common goals, revisiting the Roadmap created in 2013 and identifying practical ways to accomplish the creation of new policies were identified as a practical framework for the future of the Task Force.
4. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Discussion

This report describes the formative work undertaken for the evaluation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking. Specifically, information learned during this process illustrates both challenges and promising strategies for Task Force operations.

A key strength of this formative phase of the evaluation is the variety of perspectives represented. Diversity was achieved by incorporating the use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection, a review of historical documents, and interviewing a range of Task Force members. Finally, the participatory approach ensured that the methods and data collection tools were informed by people who have experienced trafficking. We also acknowledge a key limitation of this formative work, which is that the members and actions of this Task Force may not represent those of other task forces throughout the United States.

In the context of these strengths and limitations, we offer several summary observations. The DOSW was identified as having done an excellent job thus far, and absorbs the bulk of the responsibility overseeing the Task Force with limited staffing and a rotation of interns. Recognizing the limited funding that supports the Task Force, its ability to actualize identified needs in San Francisco is remarkable. Although many of the successes identified can no longer be solely attributed to the Task Force, they likely would not have come to fruition without having been identified during meetings and benefitted from the Task Force’s ground work that positions members to successfully advocate for funding.

When asked what concerns people have about the evaluation, the primary response was that nothing will happen with the evaluation findings. A number of interviewees had no concerns about the evaluation process, but raised concerns about the actions of the Task Force. One member expressed a need to know if unintentional harm has been caused by any Task Force actions or responses. Some members are concerned that the current framework for how trafficking is addressed is inherently problematic and focused too heavily on juvenile sex trafficking.

Task Force members who were interviewed during this formative phase all expressed interest in receiving feedback about what is working well, areas for improvement, and suggestions for moving forward. Interviewees were appreciative that the voices of a diversity of agency representatives, spanning government agencies, advocates and survivors, will be highlighted in the evaluation. Their hope is that the evaluation will initiate more thoughtful and inclusive Task Force activities and goals. They requested that the evaluation highlight strengths and limitations, provide recommendations for moving forward, and continue to include survivor input in the form of peer research staff and
community advisory board members. Those interviewed indicated that they would like to receive progress of the evaluation along the way and assistance with strategic planning and identifying tangible goals. Task Force members would like to see San Francisco’s anti-trafficking efforts become a model for other cities and communities.

These observations form the basis for recommendations in the following section.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Strategic Planning

Overwhelmingly, interviewees highlighted the need for rigorous strategic planning. They mentioned that strategic planning would be a way to create alignment, build capacity and increase the likelihood of goal achievement. Task Force members expressed willingness and commitment to collaborate and an interest in having conversations around differing frameworks and perspectives. Their hopes for strategic planning include identifying the goals of the Task Force, creating guidelines for membership, and facilitating conversations that will hopefully lead to identifying common ground among the diverse members.

Our recommendations related to the identified strategic planning needs are:

- **Diversity of Participants.** Ensure a diversity of Task Force members are included in the planning session and that representatives from each active subcommittee are involved. Once a strategic planner is identified, ask that person to offer guidance on the ideal number of people to include.

- **Work Toward Goal Identification.** The majority of those interviewed would like to see the Task Force focus more broadly on labor trafficking, prevention efforts, and addressing gaps in services. The two service gaps routinely mentioned were housing and employment options. The training and vetting of appropriate foster parents and group homes for young people experiencing trafficking was also identified as a crucial need. Some mentioned the need for diversion programs for youth charged with trafficking because they are increasingly seeing young people who have been exploited being charged.

- **Develop Goal Measurement Methods.** Once the group has identified the goals of the Task Force, develop ways to measure whether those goals are achieved. Interviewees indicated that they would like to move away from simple counts or yes/no responses to goal achievement. Instead they would like, for example, to know if trainings resulted in more people who have experienced trafficking being identified and linked to services, or if programs or policies that have been implemented are having the desired impact.
• **Create Membership Guidelines.** Most of the people interviewed were not clear about what their roles on the Task Force were. No agency has an MOU with the Task Force. At the strategic planning session it will be helpful for attendees to decide how best to move forward and explore the benefits and limitations of MOUs, membership criteria, and member guidelines.

• **Discuss how to meaningfully increase representation of impacted community members on the Task Force.** All interviewees stressed the importance of having people who have experienced trafficking actively involved on the Task Force to ensure the maintenance and creation of survivor-informed responses. Many noted the absence of people of color, queer community members, young people, members from youth leadership organizations, and recent immigrants.

• **Facilitate conversations to assist in finding common ground.** Many of those interviewed spoke to how Task Force meetings provide little space for exploring differing perspectives and working towards identifying common ground. Some Task Force members feel constrained by the presence of law enforcement at the meetings. Some members of law enforcement feel misunderstood by other Task Force members.

### 4.2.2 Data Collection

Although data collection and the need for unduplicated data was important to most of the interviewees, they shared many concerns about maintaining client confidentiality that have prevented them from reporting data.

Our recommendations for data collection are:

• **Explore ways that data collection can be conducted that ensure the confidentiality of people who have experienced trafficking.** Unduplicated counts that maintain client confidentiality are possible. The Task Force can look to data collection methods that the DPH developed to ensure the confidentiality of people living with HIV. In a meeting with Dr. Henry Fisher Raymond, Director of Behavioral Surveillance for SFDPH, he explained a number of approaches that would allow for an unduplicated account, protect client confidentiality, and be feasible for the Task Force.

• **Collect DOJ-required criminal justice data.** Task forces that receive DOJ funding are required to capture the following data: a) Number of cases investigated, by type of trafficking and immigration status; b) Percentage of investigations that
result in an arrest, by type and immigration status; c) Number of suspects charged, by type of trafficking; d) Number of cases prosecuted, by type of prosecution; and, e) Number of confirmed trafficked persons, by type of trafficking. Collecting this data will prime the Task Force to receive federal funding if it pursues another grant proposal issued by the DOJ and also offer important information that can inform the response in San Francisco.

- **Explore ways to hire a data analyst.** A dedicated staff person at the DOSW with experience in data collection and analysis and disseminating the work of the Task Force to the general public has been recommended by many respondents interviewed.

- **Assess what support agencies may need to submit data.** Not all agencies involved with the Task Force submit data, and not all those that submit data provide complete data. In addition to the confidentiality concerns mentioned previously, agencies may not have the time or resources to provide data as requested. With technical and/or financial assistance, the Task Force may be able to collect more data.

### 4.2.3 Task Force Meetings

Nearly every month of the year different Task Force meetings are held. Subcommittee meetings tend to have a smaller number of attendees than the general meeting, but not all subcommittees have members that attend the general meeting. All meetings are open to the public which means at many meetings, especially the general meeting, it is common to have new attendees present. The diverse membership means an array of expertise and perspectives are held by members.

After reviewing all available meeting minutes and attending at least one meeting of each subcommittee, we offer the following recommendations:

- **Provide an orientation for new attendees.** Those interviewed suggested that some type of orientation would be helpful for new members. Such an orientation would address what the Task Force has done, its goals, and a timeline of where the Task Force is in terms of achieving the goals. Some also mentioned it would be helpful to share with newer members what things have been tried and were not successful.

- **Utilize a consistent style for meeting minutes and consistent posting schedule.** The varying styles of meeting minutes makes it difficult at times to understand what took place at a meeting. To assist members, and the larger public, in
knowing what took place, the Task Force would benefit from using a consistent template for meeting minutes. Similarly, ensuring that minutes are posted in a timely manner will increase the likelihood that people have an up-to-date understanding of Task Force efforts.

- **Draw upon the expertise of members to offer in-service trainings at meetings.** Many of those interviewed mentioned that they would benefit from learning from their colleagues about an array of issues related to trafficking and hope that by having such trainings members may identify common ground. Topics suggested include social justice, the needs of immigrant populations (including those in the country without documentation), undocumented and unaccompanied minors attending public schools in San Francisco, forced drug trafficking, trauma experienced during immigration detentions, and sex workers who have experienced law enforcement violence. Interviewees also want time at meetings to ensure that members are aware of current policy changes and hear how agencies will train their staff on these changes. One example given was ensuring that child welfare and law enforcement train staff on SB 1322, the recent law that decriminalized prostitution for youth.
APPENDIX 1:
INTERVIEW GUIDE
In-depth Key Informant Topic Guide – Task Force Members

Introduction/Consent

Review key points from study information sheet (Interviewee will receive info sheet via email prior to interview):

This interview is to find out more about your organization and involvement in the anti-trafficking task force.

I would like to interview you about what your organization broadly does; what work you do with people who have experienced trafficking; and what your organization does in connection with the task force.

The email we sent you earlier outlined the voluntary and confidential aspects of your participation in this interview. I’ll review a few key points here:

• Participating in this interview is completely voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential if you request so. You can stop the interview at any time or choose not to answer a particular question.

• These are probably topics that you would discuss with colleagues, but if there are any responses that you would prefer be kept confidential, please let us know and we will mark them as such in our notes.

• We’ll be taking notes, but if you don’t mind we’d also like to record the conversation as a backup for our own use. Is that okay? This conversation will be shared with other Research Staff and team members.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Start recorder.
Interview Questions for Task Force Members

Organizational Context

1. Please tell me a little about the history of your agency.
   • How long has the organization been in the community?
   • Is this a public or private organization?
   • What is your role in the organization?

2. What type of work does your organization do?
   • What types of services do you provide for people who have experienced trafficking?

3. How long has the organization focused on people who have experienced trafficking? In what ways?
   • [If organization is not trafficking specific] how did it come to serve (or advocate for) people who have experienced trafficking?

4. How is the trafficking specific work funded? (i.e. grants; contracts; government funding)

5. Do people who have experienced trafficking work at your organization?
   • If yes, how many? What roles?
   • If no, why do you think there aren't any experienced trafficking survivors representing the organization?
     o Do you think it would be beneficial to have a survivor as part of the team? If yes, in what way?
     o What would it take for people who have experienced trafficking to hold paid positions at your organization?

Clients who have Experienced Trafficking [ask only of people who do direct service work]

6. Please describe the types of people your organization works with who have experienced trafficking. [i.e. youths/adults; domestic/international; labor/sex; cisgender/transgender/genderqueer?]
• What percentage of your clients have experienced trafficking?
• How are people who have experienced trafficking identified by your organization? Or, how are they referred to your organization?
• What types of services do they say they need? Which of these are you able to provide?
  • What types of services do staff think they need? Which of these are you able to provide?

7. Please describe how your agency assesses the person’s satisfaction with the services they received through your organization? How about the effectiveness of the services?
   a. Any aftercare resources once the person is no longer a client?

Information on Referrals  [ask only of people who do direct service work]

8. Tell me about how the process works when you refer someone from your agency to another agency.
   • How do you decide who to refer?
   • Any input from the client about what they are looking for?
   • How do you know if that person made it to the referred services? Types of services received there? (probe: any support provided in helping person get to referral)
   • Are there ways in which your agency assesses the person’s satisfaction with the services they received through the other organization?

9. What records or data systems do you have that track referrals you make to other agencies?
   • What do you do with this data?

10. Tell me what happens when another agency refers someone to you for services.
    • Do you communicate with them to let them know the person made it? Services they received? Services they need?
    • Does the referring agency follow-up with the client?
    • What records or data systems store information on people who are referred to you?
      ▪ What do you do with this data?

Implementation of Task Force (DOSW-specific questions)

11. What has facilitated the implementation of the task force?

12. What obstacles have been encountered in implementing the task force?
    • Have they been overcome, and if so, how?

13. How many people who have experienced trafficking are members of the task force?
    • What types of trafficking have they experienced? How many are adults? How many youth?
    • What supports are in place for these people to participate in the task force? What prevents them for participating? Ideas for addressing barriers?
14. How are survivors sought out/asked to take part in the Task Force? Are they financially compensated for their professional input/expertise?

Task Force Operations (DOSW-specific questions)

15. Whose responsibility is it to create the task force agendas and take minutes? Does this vary between the main meeting and subcommittee meetings?

16. Is there a single point of contact to coordinate all contact with the media, or does each member respond based on their own agency’s protocols? What are the benefits/limitations of this?

17. How can agencies or organizations in your community request training and presentations from the task force?

18. How are funds available to the task force divided up in order to support task force operations?
   - Which organization is responsible for grant administration?

19. Which agencies are most active in the task force? Individuals?
   - What makes them most essential?

20. Are there prior relationships among key players that have helped or hindered the task force?

21. In what forum do discussions about ongoing cases take place? Is there a committee dedicated to this?
   - Is there a clear delineation among law enforcement task force members of who is the lead investigative unit based on victim typology?
   - Is the local police department expected to take sole or lead investigative responsibilities for a case prosecuted at the state level?

22. Are there different victim services organizations designated as the lead depending on victim typology?

Task Force Involvement

23. Why did your agency become involved with the task force?
   - When did your agency become a part of the task force?
   - How many people from your agency are involved with the task force?
   - When did you become involved with the task force?
     - What is your role on the task force? (probe: how feel about role; challenges/limitations of role; benefits/successes of role)

24. Do you/your agency have a formal MOU in place with the task force?
[If yes] What does it specify as the scope of work?
[If no] What is your understanding of the role your agency plays on the task force? What is expected of your organization?

25. How often are you, or other providers at this agency, in communication with other task force members outside of the scheduled meetings?

26. In what contexts do you have interactions with them? (ex. case review/co-case management/multidisciplinary team meeting; inter-agency meetings; conferences, personal communication)

28. What types of things do you talk about when you interact with other task force members? (ex. how to refer someone; assessing appropriateness of referral; discussing service needs of a particular client; advocacy issues; co-case management)

29. How is client confidentiality maintained?
   a. Do you need a release of information form to talk to these agencies about a specific client?

30. Has your agency ever been involved in a federal trafficking case?
   b. If so, how are federal cases handled/coordinated through the SFPD?

Task Force in Action

31. What would you say are the major strengths of the task force?

32. What parts of the task force have been less successful and why?
   • How have they been addressed?
     o [if doesn’t think have been addressed] How do you think they should be addressed

33. Have there been any unexpected outcomes?
   • [if yes] What are they?

34. How are goals for the task force identified? (ex. who creates the goals?)
   • What are the goals of the task force?
   • How do you know if the goals are being met? How do you track progress towards achieving the goals?
     o What challenges have the task force encountered while trying to achieve those goals?

35. In addition to the goals you already mentioned, what other goals would you or your organization like to see the task force have?
   • What would be the process to get the task force to work towards those goals?
   • What would be the best way to assess whether the task force is achieving those goals?

36. What successes has the task force already experienced? How have these successes been measured?
• What other successes would you like to see happen in the future?

37. How does the task force interact and engage with the public?

38. How does the task force decide which community or organizational events to promote?

Wrap Up

39. What do you think are the future plans for the task force?
   • What would you like to see happen?

40. What is most important to you about this evaluation?
   • What concerns might you have?

41. Anything else you would like to share before we end the interview?

Thank you so much for your participation. Once we have cleaned up our notes from this interview we will share them with you. That way you can have a copy for your records and also make sure we accurately captured your responses.
APPENDIX 2:
LEVELS OF COLLABORATION DATA COLLECTION TOOL
Levels of Collaboration Scale

This form is designed for those who work in one of the organizations or programs that are represented on the task force. Answer options are on a scale ranging from 0 to 5, with 0 indicating *no interaction at all*, and 5 representing total collaboration. Please review these descriptions of different levels of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Levels of Collaboration and Their Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aware of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loosely defined roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All decisions are made independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide information to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Somewhat defined roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All decisions are made independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share information and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Defined roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some shared decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share ideas and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent and prioritized communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All members have a vote in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members belong to one system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent communication is characterized by mutual trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consensus is reached on all decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A note about how we determined who to include: We reviewed the available meeting minutes from 2015 and 2016 (including subcommittee minutes). If an organization/individual attended 2 or more meetings during that time period we included them in the spreadsheet.

Instructions
- In the grid on the next page please circle the name of the organization or group with which you are associated.

- If you do not see the name of your organization or group and you want to fill out the grid, please write your name/the name of your organization on the next page and proceed with the rest of the instructions.

- Using the scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you currently interact with the listed partner. (Skip your own row.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Partners</th>
<th>No Interaction at All</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Cannons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APILO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women's Shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSWAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Massage Therapy Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Prevention Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney – Victim Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOSW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH - Newcomers Health Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Department of Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Children’s Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JaMel Perkins (Individual)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services for Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Never Fails</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYRIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALLS Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not For Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Labor Standards Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI International (a1x kutnick)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeHouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCAH/T/NCJW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFMTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD – Special Victims Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Unified School District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHADE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Mercy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner Truth Family Foster Youth Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Infirmary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Medical Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Tang’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US PROStitutes Collective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings attended in 2016

**Instructions:** Please circle below the meetings you have attended this year. If this is your first meeting of the year, please circle not applicable.

**Not Applicable** (This is the first meeting I’ve attended this year)

**General Task Force Meetings:**
- February
- April
- June

**Child Sex Trafficking Committee Meetings:**
- February
- April
- June
- August

**Sex Work & Trafficking Policy Impact Committee Meetings:**
- January
- March
- May
- July

**Labor Trafficking Committee Meetings:**
- March
- June
Please respond to the following questions:

What do you think about the current levels of collaboration?

What are your desired levels of collaboration?

What steps are needed to move towards your ideal level of collaboration?

What would it look like if you reached that level of collaboration?

What actions do you need and want to take to bring about the ideal level of collaboration?

What would indicate that you’ve reached that ideal level?

Please share any successes you’ve experienced with cultivating collaborations.

What are some lessons you’ve learned in the process of trying to cultivate collaborations?

What have been some of the challenges or unintended consequences with cultivating collaborations?
Appendix 3:
Successes Identified in Annual Reports
Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking

First Year Highlights: 2013

The Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking started meeting in March of 2013. During its first year, the Mayor’s Task Force has generated a strong collaboration among city and community agencies. A chart of the attendees follows. Highlights of the first year include:

Specialized Committees
The Task Force agreed to form three committees: (1) Child Sex Trafficking; (2) Illicit Massage Parlor; and (3) Labor. During the first year, the focus was on Child Sex Trafficking and Illicit Massage Parlors. The Child Sex Trafficking committee was the most active, meeting monthly. The Illicit Massage Parlor committee met quarterly. The general Task Force met bi-monthly.

Data Collection
The Task Force agreed on the need to start collecting data on the number of trafficking cases each agency handles, to be compiled into an annual report. The Task Force devoted much time to developing a data collection tool, which is in its final stages.

Matrix of Services
The Task Force mapped out the services that currently exist for trafficking survivors in San Francisco.

Identification of Crucial Needed After Hours Response to Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Youth
The Child Sex Trafficking Committee identified a crucial gap in existing services which must be filled: the need for an after-hours emergency response to commercially, sexually exploited children. This need is detailed more fully in the attached proposal.

SB 1193 Outreach Efforts
On March 5, 2014, 687 letters were mailed to businesses affected by SB 1193, which requires certain California establishments to post anti-trafficking notices. The letters were accompanied by a letter signed by the Mayor and Police Chief, and a fact sheet. On April 5, 2014, there will be a community day of action to visit businesses and check whether the poster is up.

Strengthening of Enforcement of Illicit Activities at Massage Parlors
Supervisor Tang successfully sponsored an ordinance that strengthened regulation of massage parlors where trafficking may be occurring. Importantly, this ordinance eliminated penalties levied against employees of the massage parlors, who may be trafficking victims.
Policy and Protocol Development
The Human Services Agency has, for the first time, created a screening tool to screen youth for child sex trafficking, and is piloting it with several youth serving agencies. Once finalized, it will be available to all the agencies which interact with youth who may be at risk of child sex trafficking.

Training
- The Juvenile Probation Department will be prioritizing training in child sex trafficking for the upcoming year.
- The San Francisco Unified School District will be training all of its wellness center staff in child sex trafficking.
- All inspectors of the Department of Public Health have been trained in spotting signs of human trafficking.

Participation in the U.S. Attorney’s Joint Task Force Meeting
On January 13, 2014, members of the Task Force presented on our accomplishments at the Northern District of California Human Trafficking Task Force meeting organized by the U.S. Attorney’s office. We received feedback that our presentation was among the best organized of the various task forces.

Diana Oliva-Aroche honored as Modern Day Abolitionist
On February 11, 2014, Diana Oliva-Aroche, the Director of Violence Prevention Services for the Mayor’s Office, was honored by the San Francisco Collaborative Against Human Trafficking as a Modern Day Abolitionist, for her work co-chairing the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking.
Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking
Second Year Highlights: 2014

The Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking continued to make strong strides during its second year of meeting, in 2014. A chart of the attendees follows. Highlights of the second year include:

I. New Specialized Committees
The Task Force added two new committees, bringing the active committees to four: (1) Child Sex Trafficking; (2) Illicit Massage Parlor; (3) Sex Worker & Trafficking; and (4) Super Bowl and Trafficking.

II. Data Collection
The Task Force approved developing a data collection tool, and agreed to collect data for the last six months of 2014. Twelve government departments and eight non-profit agencies will be providing data.

III. Identification of Crucial Needed After Hours Response to Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Youth
The Child Sex Trafficking Committee identified a crucial gap in existing services which must be filled: the need for an after-hours emergency response to commercially, sexually exploited children and drafted a proposal to fund this need. Funding has not yet been secured for this service, and the Task Force continues to advocate for funding.

IV. SB 1193 Outreach Efforts
San Francisco collaborated with Alameda and San Mateo counties to design an anti-human trafficking notice containing all 3 required languages. On March 5, 2014, posters were mailed to 687 businesses affected by SB 1193, which requires certain California establishments to post anti-trafficking notices. The letters were accompanied by a letter signed by the Mayor and Police Chief, and a fact sheet. On April 5, 2014, San Francisco participated in a city wide check of bars, hospitals, and adult establishments. Thirty-three volunteers fanned out to 13 neighborhoods and visited 203 San Francisco businesses for the presence and appropriate placement of the poster. The Department of Public Health has also agreed to start monitoring for the presence of the poster when they inspect bars and massage establishments.

V. Strengthening of Enforcement of Illicit Activities at Massage Parlors
The Department of Public Health assembled a compelling analysis of illegal activities at massage establishments in San Francisco, and was influential in shaping state legislation which passed in 2014 and brought back local control of massage establishments. The Illicit Massage Parlor Committee identified the need for bilingual health outreach workers to connect with women who might be trafficked at massage establishments, resulting in a budget request to the City to fund these positions.

VI. Policy and Protocol Development
The Human Services Agency agreed to opt into the state Department of Social Services’ program for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children. Building on relationships established through the Task Force, Family and Children’s Services will be creating an interagency protocol for responding to sexually trafficked youth.

The Sex Worker and Trafficking committee identified the need for policies at the Police Department and District Attorney’s office that would create an environment where sex workers who were victims or witnesses to violent crimes (like rape or trafficking) could feel safe reporting those crimes without fear of being arrested. Significant progress on the District Attorney policy took place in 2014, and the policy should be complete in 2015. The Police Department has also agreed on the need for a parallel policy.

VII. Super Bowl Planning
The Task Force forged new collaborations with Super Bowl 50 Host Committee and the regional efforts coordinated by the South Bay Coalition to End Human Trafficking. Human trafficking training for hospitality industry staff and discussion of supply chain audits were begun.

VIII. Expanded Funding
The Department on the Status of Women approved funding for several new programs addressing human trafficking. Beginning in FY 15-16 pending final budget approval, Not for Sale will receive funding for its vocational program for sexually trafficked young adults; Safe House will receive funding for case work for its clients; and St. James Infirmary will receive funding for a “bad date” data system to expand a program that facilitates sex workers giving and getting information about dangerous predators.
IX. Training

• The San Francisco Unified School District trained all wellness center staff in child sex trafficking.

• The Department of Public Health trained 88 Environmental Health inspectors (who inspect restaurants and massage establishments) in spotting signs of human trafficking.
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City and County of San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force Road Map
City and County of San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force Road Map

San Francisco has been named one of the top 13 cities in the country for human trafficking by the FBI. On March 4th, 2013, the Department of the Status of Women, Human Rights Commission and Mayor’s Office convened a meeting with key stakeholders from the Department of Public Health, Office of the District Attorney, San Francisco Police Department, and U.S. Attorney’s Office to discuss the forming of a San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Taskforce. The Mayor’s Office agreed to work with city agencies to review current efforts and begin drafting the framework for the taskforce [sic]. The following is a framework for a taskforce [sic] built on current and existing resources. The Department on the Status of Women has been tagged to staff the Task Force.

Purpose

The San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force shall oversee a comprehensive, victim-centered approach that effectively intervenes in human trafficking situations and focuses on long-term solutions to this pervasive problem.

Responsibilities

The mission of the San Francisco Anti-Human Trafficking Taskforce will be to advance anti-trafficking efforts in the following ways:

1. Examine the nature and scope of human trafficking across San Francisco and the Bay Area;
2. Evaluate progress in combating human trafficking in San Francisco;
3. Identify challenges and opportunities in protecting and assisting victims and bringing traffickers to justice;
4. Identify and address gaps in services to victims of human trafficking;
5. Create a city-wide strategic plan including milestones and timelines;
6. Release an annual report on Task Force activities.

Potential Partners

- Adult Probation Department
- Board of Appeals
- Board of Supervisors
- CASARC
- City Attorney’s Office
- Department of Building Inspection
- Department on the Status of Women
- Fire Department
- Human Rights Commission
- Human Services Agency - Family & Children’s Services
- Juvenile Probation Department
- Mayor’s Office
- Office of the District Attorney
- Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement
- Planning Department
- Police Department
• Department of Public Health – Branches: Environmental Health; Community Behavioral Health Services, Community Health Promotion (health educators, prevention programs), Center for Learning and Innovation (trainings), Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health
• San Francisco Unified School District
• Treasurer/Tax Collector
• U.S. Department of Justice
• Victim Witness, District Attorney’s Office
• Community-based Organizations (preliminary list)
  o Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach
  o Asian Women’s Shelter
  o CARC Diversion
  o Freedom House
  o F.D. Homes Girls Group Home/Nalls Foundation
  o Jewish Coalition to End Human Trafficking
  o Larkin Street Youth Services
  o Mujeres Unidas Y Activas
  o Stand Against Global Exploitation (SAGE)
• San Francisco Collaborative Against Human Trafficking (SFCAHT)
• Cross Bay Collaborative to Combat Human Trafficking

Goals and Objectives

A. OVERARCHING GOAL – Incorporate human trafficking work into San Francisco’s Violence Prevention Plan - “Interrupt, Predict, and Organize for a Safer San Francisco.”
  Lead Agency: Mayor’s Office.

B. POLICY DEVELOPMENT: Develop protocols within city agencies to identify human trafficking, improve enforcement, and support the needs of trafficking survivors, with a focus on Massage Parlors, Child Sex Trafficking, and Labor Trafficking.
  Lead Agencies: ALL.

C. TRAINING AND PUBLIC AWARENESS: Through training and public outreach, ensure awareness among city departments, schools, community and faith-based organizations, businesses and industries which potentially interface with trafficking victims.
  Lead Agencies: Police Department, Department of Public Health, Department on the Status of Women.

GOAL 1: Increase awareness of human trafficking by coordinating with existing training activities, developing and implementing training.

GOAL 2: Collaborate to design targeted training on child sex trafficking for individuals who work with at-risk youth (child welfare system, school and afterschool programs, juvenile probation officers, health providers, outreach workers, etc.).

GOAL 3: Engage the hospitality and restaurant industries in awareness and training on the warning signs and appropriate responses to suspected trafficking

GOAL 4: Promote public awareness and outreach campaigns around major events that are likely to attract human traffickers, such as major sporting events.
GOAL 5: Build partnerships with non-profit agencies and groups in the development and provision of training

D. LAW ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE: Advance a coordinated city-wide response among law enforcement agencies.
Lead Agencies: District Attorney, Police Department, Department of Public Health, City Attorney, U.S. Attorney, US Coast Guard.

GOAL 1: Increase the number of investigations initiated through proactive law enforcement and other entities.

GOAL 2: Increase the number identified victims of human trafficking through proactive law enforcement tactics and cooperation with other entities, and to refer victims to appropriate services.

GOAL 3: Increase the number of individuals arrested for human trafficking through effective law enforcement tactics and cooperation with other entities.

GOAL 4: Decrease the demand for human trafficking by focusing on identifying, arresting, and educating human trafficking offenders.

GOAL 5: Decrease the number of human trafficking victims transported into California by developing and implementing a system by which to gather, maintain, and disseminate information identifying the victims of human trafficking communities and countries of origin, the communities and countries of origin of the individual human traffickers and human trafficking organizations, and the points of entry, routes, and means (i.e.: marine vessels, land vehicles, air transport, etc.) utilized to do so.

GOAL 6: Decrease the number of domestically trafficked victims, particularly from the foster care system.

GOAL 7: Increase the number of prosecutions of human traffickers.

GOAL 8: Decrease the number of individuals and organizations participating in the trafficking of humans.

E. CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM RESPONSE
Lead Agencies: Human Services Agency, Juvenile Probation Department, Police Department, Department of Public Health’s Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health branch.


GOAL 2: Ensure safety and identity of sexually trafficking children, and ensure that they are treated as victims, get individualized treatment, and are provided services.
**GOAL 3:** Engage the court system in developing a comprehensive and culturally competent response to human trafficking.

**F. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION (NGO) RESPONSE:** Advance a coordinated, city-wide response among community based agencies including case management, shelter, and prevention.  
*Lead Agencies:* API Legal Outreach, Asian Women’s Shelter, Larkin Street Youth Services, SAGE, faith based groups, recipient of DOSW Human Trafficking grant.

**GOAL 1:** Provide comprehensive and culturally competent emergency services to help victims heal, physically and mentally.

**GOAL 2:** Provide comprehensive and culturally competent transitional services to help victims secure placement/housing and employment/education.

**GOAL 3:** Assist in development of policies and trainings to prevent, identify and intervene effectively with trafficking survivors

**G. DATA COLLECTION:** Develop a centralized data base for systematic collection of human trafficking data to increase resource and information sharing between all city agencies and related NGOs.  

**H. COLLABORATION:** Collaborate with local, state and federal agencies on prevention and intervention of human trafficking.

*This road map is a work in progress and will be updated periodically.*
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LEVELS OF COLLABORATION SCALE: ABSENT AGENCIES

Adult Probation
Annie Cannons
BAYSWAN
City Attorney's Office
Family and Children's Services
FBI
Freedom House
Homeland Security
Juvenile Probation
Larkin Street Youth Services
Legal Services for Children
Love Never Fails
Lyric
Mayor's Office
Mortar Foundation
Not For Sale
Office of Labor Standards Enforcement
SFMTA
SFPD
SFUSD
St. Mary's Medical Center
Supervisor Tang's Office
US PROStitutes Collective