



County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Director

FESIA A. DAVENPORT
Chief Deputy Director

July 15, 2013

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District
DON KNABE
Fourth District
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

To: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Philip L. Browning, Director
Jerry Powers, Chief Probation Officer *RP for J.P.*

RESPONSE TO THE NOVEMBER 27, 2012 BOARD MOTION ON SEX TRAFFICKING TASK FORCE

On November 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors directed the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Probation Department to:

1. Convene a task force to address the issue of sex trafficking of minors within the foster care system in collaboration with the Los Angeles County Probation Department, Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health and others.
2. Culminate monthly meetings of the task force and provide a report back within six months to include:
 - a. Background information on the scope of the problem in Los Angeles County;
 - b. Current barriers and hurdles to address the issue;
 - c. Best practices utilized in other jurisdictions across the Country; and
 - d. Recommendations related to DCFS minors involved in sex trafficking and a plan to effectively address the recruitment of these minors within the system.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Supervisors with an update on the status of the Task Force and its efforts to develop a multi-agency response model for Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC).

In response to the Board Motion, the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Los Angeles County Probation Department (Probation) created a task force to address the increasing incidence of commercial sexual exploitation of children in Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County CSEC Task Force ("Task Force"), chaired by Michelle Guymon of Probation and Roberta Medina of DCFS, was tasked with examining the scope of the problem of commercially sexually exploited children in Los Angeles, identifying the current barriers and challenges in addressing the issue, surveying best practices utilized both in California and throughout the country, and developing recommendations to address the intersection of the child welfare system and commercial sexual exploitation.

Convening for the first time on January 22, 2013, the Task Force brought together over 100 members from the public and private sector. A total of five taskforce meetings were held between January and June of 2013.¹ Membership on the Task Force, included representatives from the County agencies that engage with commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC) and included members of non-profit agencies providing advocacy, treatment, placement, and survivor services for this population:

- Juvenile Justice - Judge Nash, Commissioner Pratt, & Judge Groman
- Law Enforcement – Los Angeles Sheriff's Department/Special Victims Richard Ruiz & Vice Officer Jeff Walker and Los Angeles Police Department
- District Attorney – Kerry White of the Juvenile Division Program
- Federal Bureau of Investigation – Debbie Deem/ICAN CSEC Co chair
- County Counsel – Deborah Hale
- ICAN – Deanne Tilton
- Los Angeles City Attorney's Office – Donna Edmiston and Tracy Webb
- Private Investigators from the City of Pasadena – James Elliot
- Children's Service Commissioner Susan Friedman
- Children's Law Center (CLC) - Leslie Heimov, Executive Director and various attorneys from CLC.
- Alliance for Children's Rights- Laura Streimer
- National Center for Youth Law
- Survivor and Advocate agencies: Coalition Against Slavery and Trafficking (CAST), Saving Innocence, Mary Magdalene Project, Runaway Girl, and Zoe Children's Homes and YWCA of Greater Los Angeles
- Group Homes: David & Margaret, Crittenden, Aviva Center, and Rosemary's Cottage
- FFA Homes: ACHSA Bruce Seltzer, Executive Director
- Department of Mental Health, Zoe Trachenberg
- Various DCFS staff from Multi-Agency Response Team(MART), Runaway Outreach Unit (ROU), Juvenile Court Services, and Clinical Resources

In order to address the tasks outlined by the Board motion, the Task Force divided into four subcommittees to more deeply explore the issues.

The four subcommittees focused on:

¹ Meetings occurred on January 22, 2013, March 15th, 2013, April 18th, 2013, May 16th, 2013 and June 20th, 2013.

The four subcommittees focused on:

- 1) Specialized placement services,
- 2) Training and awareness,
- 3) Specialized treatment services, and
- 4) Identification and response

The four subcommittees appointed workgroup chairs, convened meetings outside of the larger task force meetings, and provided feedback on challenges and recommendations for Los Angeles County.

Below is a description of the findings of the Task Force and its subcommittees. Also included is a proposal outlining next steps LA County should take to develop a coordinated and strategic response model that compliments existing best practices models in the nation that have the potential to be replicated within California.

I. Scope of the Problem

The Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) identified Los Angeles as one of the nation's thirteen high intensity child prostitution areas. Although this problem was believed to be an international problem, current statistical data demonstrate that children also from the United States are trafficked. In 2011 and 2012, California's nine human trafficking task forces identified 1,277 victims, seventy-two percent of whom were United States citizens. Unfortunately data on commercially sexually exploited children is limited. Los Angeles has begun to collect data to better understand the scope of the problem.

After receiving a State grant in 2009, to address sex trafficked children in Los Angeles County, the Probation Department began tracking the number of children arrested for prostitution and related offenses. The numbers over the past several years have varied, but it demonstrates a significant problem for the County. In 2010, 174 youth under eighteen were arrested, in 2011 there were 211 arrests and in 2012 the number fell to 170. However, we know that many children are never arrested, or are arrested for other crimes related to their exploitation. For example, in 2011, thirty-seven girls being detained at Juvenile Hall for other non-related offenses disclosed that they were being commercially sexually exploited. These thirty-seven girls were not arrested for prostitution, and had not previously been identified by the Department as CSEC. Analysis of Probation data also demonstrated that a majority of these children are arrested in two areas of Los Angeles, Service Planning Areas (SPA) six and eight, respectively South Central Los Angeles, and the South Bay, which includes Long Beach.

The Los Angeles County Superior Court also received a State grant to develop a specialized court to address the needs of sex trafficked children. For the last two years the Succeeding through Achievement and Resilience (STAR) Court has presided over numerous Juvenile Delinquency cases involving CSEC. Many of these children come in with prostitution charges, but others self-disclose while in detention, and are subsequently referred to the Court. The Court follows a collaborative, multi-disciplinary model where key agencies work together to address the identified needs and safety of the child. Through this specialized court, the youth is provided with the services of a victim-centered response team, inclusive of survivors, to help them with their physical and mental health issues, and to support them with housing,

education and training services. They have access to group home placement with agencies, in and outside of California, that have specialized training in the supervision and care of victims of sex trafficking. They are linked to health, mental health, and educational based service programs. They are linked to a "survivor" who provides counseling and advocates on the youths behalf. Each provider in this network has been trained in the My Life My Choice (MLMC) curriculum. The My Life My Choice Project (MLMC) is a nationally recognized initiative designed to reach adolescent girls most vulnerable to commercial sexual exploitation. The program provides a unique continuum of prevention, victim identification, intervention services, and offers training, prevention groups, case coordination and survivor mentoring to victims of exploitation. In addition, each provider continues to implement processes within the placement structures to facilitate this modality of treatment. Youth in this program are placed in locked settings during their initial assessment in juvenile halls and then subsequently released to a least restrictive setting such as a group home, foster home, or the home of a relative or parent.

A trend emerged while working with these children: a majority, nearly eighty percent, originated from families that have had prior involvement with the child welfare system. Probation and DCFS found that, of the 70 girls, 15 were under dual-status jurisdiction and had both open Probation and DCFS cases. The DCFS youth in this program have been arrested and participate in a 241.1 joint assessment process by a multi-agency team which consists of the minor's attorney, probation officer, social worker, mental health, and an educational consultant. Together the team completes a comprehensive assessment of the youth and develops a joint case plan which incorporates case plan goals which also addresses the requirement of the status of probation and plans for the child's placement. This plan is then reviewed by the Delinquency and/or Dependency court and a recommendation is made in the best interest of the child as to which agency is best suited to meet the child's needs. This 241.1 process is also used for youth with non-CSEC related offenses as well. In Los Angeles County dual supervision is recommended in the majority of these cases.

Recognizing this intersection, in order to track reports of commercial sexual exploitation through referrals coming into its Child Protection Hotline, DCFS created a specialized project code within the Child Welfare Services and Case Management System (CWS/CMS). Since January 2013, the Child Protection Hotline in Los Angeles has received and identified over 166 referrals that had allegations or information consistent with risk criteria for CSEC. It was further determined that there were three distinct types of situations in which youth entered the Child Welfare system:

1. Youth that have an open existing case with DCFS related to familial abuse or neglect and becomes victims of sexual exploitation during a runaway episode or recruited within an existing foster home setting.
2. The youth have an open case with Probation related to delinquency behavior and become victims of sexual exploitation during a runaway episode or are recruited within an existing foster home setting.
3. The community youth that have no prior history with DCFS and/or Probation and fall prey to the pimps or our unwilling abducted into "the life."

DCFS continues to address jurisdictional challenges related to the investigation of incidences when a third party, not the parent or guardian, is the alleged perpetrator.

In exploring these trends further, the Probation Department determined that the prevalence of sex trafficking in Los Angeles County is not limited to children, but also identified former victims of commercial sexual exploitation within their young adult population. In 2010, 2,351 adult women between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four were arrested on prostitution charges. These 2,351 adults were never previously identified as victims which means they have likely endured years of exploitation, violence, and escalating criminal justice system involvement, based upon the fact that the average age of entry into exploitation is between the age of twelve and fourteen.

Although still in its development stage, Los Angeles County is the first county in California to monitor and track this level of data on CSEC victims in this manner.

II. Currently identified Challenges and Barriers

Through the work of the Task Force, its subcommittees, the California Child Welfare Council, and independent research, a number of challenges and barriers to serving and supporting commercially sexually exploited children emerged. The themes identified by the subcommittees have been echoed in other forums at both the state and national level. These challenges can be separated into four areas:

- **Prevalence and Identification**
 - The scope of the problem is currently unknown.
 - Agencies have difficulty identifying CSEC due to the hidden nature of the crime, youth rarely see themselves as victims, and public systems do not have a systematic process for identifying youth who interface with their systems.
 - Promising practices and screening and assessment tools have been developed to identify and engage youth, but they have not been implemented in Los Angeles.

- **Prevention and Training**
 - Currently there is limited prevention programming for both boys and girls in the system that provides information on healthy relationships, the dynamics of exploitation, and the mental and physical health consequences. Due to their prior abuse and neglect, children in the child welfare system are at increased risk of exploitation.
 - Group homes are prime recruiting grounds for exploiters, and as such could be prioritized for prevention education.
 - Although many public agencies have received "CSEC 101" training, very few public agencies have received training on how to respond once a youth has been identified or disclose.
 - Few training efforts have focused on models that take into account stages of exploitation and the coercive dynamics of exploitation, even though these models exist, are utilized in other jurisdictions, and have been shown to be effective.

- **Specialized Services and Placements**

- There is a lack of specialized services available to CSEC outside of the juvenile justice system.
 - In order to access services through the STAR court, a youth must be adjudicated a delinquent.
 - A continuum of care model has not been developed to address the needs of this population.
 - There are a limited number of placement options that are trained to support and serve CSEC.
 - Many of the placement options that are available are not in a family context, and instead are group home settings, which can often present a risk for those children that have been exploited and the other children in the group home who may be at risk of peer recruitment.
 - The current licensing requirements on placements limit flexibility and penalize the providers for typical relapse behavior.
 - For those few agencies in Los Angeles that do assist with placement of these youth, the increased frequency in which these youth run away negatively impact their standing in State compliance audits.
- **Multi-System and Data Coordination**
 - The agencies that deal with CSEC victims, all have differing mandates and requirements, and thus have difficulty collaborating to provide a multi-disciplinary response.
 - No multi-agency protocols exist in Los Angeles to guide the public and private systems on identification and response strategies for CSEC victims.
 - There is a lack of data collection among the public and private agencies.
 - The data that is collected is difficult to aggregate and analyze because the various data points collected are not uniform across systems.
 - Information is not typically shared, which results in re-traumatization of the child, as they have to "re-tell" their story multiple times to the various agencies with which they interact. Further, even when information is shared, a common language is not utilized among the systems.
 - Protocol to collect and share data that takes into account privacy and confidentiality laws does not exist.

Along with the above identified challenges, there is growing concern among California Child Welfare Agencies and other county agencies about the budgetary impact related to the implementation and expansion of as yet undeveloped specialized CSEC services. Specifically, the costs associated with specialized training for county workers, specialized placements, treatment, technical assistance for multi-agency protocols and data analysis will require additional funding. Although Probation has been extremely generous with its grant funded resources and budget to assist with costs related to countywide CSEC training, the identification of sources for additional revenues to ensure a required countywide, effective, and sustainable coordinated response model for CSEC cases.

III. Promising Practices

Many exploited children are known, in some capacity, to the child welfare system, however their exploitation often goes unnoticed until they are arrested by law enforcement. Recognizing

the crossover with the child welfare system, several jurisdictions throughout the country have developed a child welfare led response to identify exploited and at risk children and to provide early intervention and prevention services. Federal and State governments have also become involved and interested in this issue. Two pieces of legislation, one set introduced Congress HR1732 (Bass)/SB327(Lee) and the other by the California State Senate SB738 (Yee), call on the federal and State governments to provide further guidance to enable State child welfare agencies to serve the needs of trafficked and at-risk children. However, SB738 will be a two-year bill; it will be considered by the Legislature next year. If approved, the law will not be effective until January 1, 2015.

A number of States have developed coordinated responses led by the child welfare agencies, including: Connecticut, Oregon and Florida.

Connecticut

The Connecticut Department of Children and Families (CDCF) has developed a coordinated, multi-system response to address the needs of commercial sexually exploited children. CDCF developed practice guidelines for child welfare staff to screen children for commercial sexual exploitation, accept reports of commercial sexual exploitation over the abuse hotline, track information and collect data, and provide services and supports for victims of CSE through a coordinated and collaborative approach. The key components of CDCF's coordinated response include:

- Screen every child that comes into the child welfare system
- Enhanced mental and physical health assessments
- Emergency room protocol to expedite examinations and sensitize staff to dynamics of exploitation
- A continuum of specialized placements (emergency beds to semi-secure facilities)
- A human trafficking liaison in each region of Connecticut
- Extensive training modules for CDCF staff, foster parents, group homes, judges court staff, nurses, doctors, teachers and law enforcement
- Trauma informed care model that integrates the principles of Stages of Change and a Harm Reduction Model

Oregon

Oregon, and specifically Multnomah County, which encompasses Portland, has developed a coordinated and collaborative response to the increasing population of sex trafficked and at risk children. A team of both public and private partners developed the response that built on existing programming to ensure the services and supports would be available to youth beyond specialized funding sources. The team included representatives from the juvenile justice, child welfare, substance abuse, mental and physical health, homeless youth, and faith-based agencies and organizations. The team focused its energy on developing CSEC specific capacity within existing youth programming and services. Additionally, law enforcement in Portland no longer arrests minors for prostitution or related offenses. Instead, police work closely with a sexual assault response/rape crisis center, and make reports to the child welfare agency when they suspect commercial sexual exploitation. The child welfare system is now able to screen CSEC into its system, even if the perpetrator is a third party. Child welfare has

identified over 250 children who are victims of sex trafficking since 2008. Key components of the collaborative response include:

- A multi-disciplinary trafficking unit that houses district attorneys, child abuse hotline staff and investigators, and law enforcement partners that specialize in sex crimes
- Dedicated CSEC trained staff within child welfare (5.5 full time employees) that maintain smaller case loads
- First responder protocol that provides guidance once youth have been identified
 - Response includes:
 - Report to the child abuse hotline
 - Referral to the sexual assault response/rape crisis provider
 - Initial assessments of the needs of victim administered by licensed clinicians
 - Specialized and emergency placements
- Partner with homeless and other placement providers to house and provide specialized CSEC services
- Have monthly, multi-disciplinary team meetings to discuss cases that are CSEC related
- Able to open child welfare case where the third party is a perpetrator. Parents do not have negative, long-term implications if they are not at fault.
- Child abuse Screening policy now requires a child protective services (CPS) assessment when:
 - 1) a report "constitutes a report a child abuse," AND
 - 2) "the alleged perpetrator may have access to the alleged child victim," AND
 - 3) "the parent or caregiver may not be able or willing to protect the child."
- Child welfare cases do not require a named perpetrator
- Continuum of placement options (open, staff secure, locked, psychiatric holds, etc.)
- Requests for proposals for providers include requirements on CSEC

Florida

The Florida Department of Children and Families (FDCF) released guidance on the special requirements for intakes, investigations, and subsequent services related to commercial sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, and labor trafficking victims. The guidance applies to the FDCF staff (hotline, child protective service investigations, etc.) and its subcontracted service providers. Child abuse hotline now must generate an intake for all human trafficking allegations both domestic and international.

The protocol outlines the response based on whether a parent or guardian or a third party is the perpetrator. Additionally, there is guidance on steps to take when an "institutional entity" (group home, foster parent, etc.) is the perpetrator. After receiving a report alleging human trafficking, an investigation takes place, a multi-disciplinary team is formed, and a safety assessment is completed. The multi-disciplinary team includes community based care agency that serves as the lead, legal representatives (District attorneys, public defenders, child's attorney, civil legal advocate), victim advocates, refugee services if an international victim, law enforcement, child welfare, and probation. Placements and other service providers for victims of human trafficking now have more stringent contract requirements including: placement security measures, specialized array of services, and placement policies and procedures that increase supervision of technology usage.

California Counties

Along with the above models, there are other counties in California (Alameda, San Bernardino, Orange, etc.) that are currently involved in developing a CSEC/Human Trafficking response for their respective jurisdiction. Since CSEC cases are often multi-jurisdictional and sometimes national in nature, it is imperative that the Los Angeles County's response model effectively collaborates with all areas and jurisdictions. Furthermore, since each jurisdiction in California has its own approach to responding to these cases, Los Angeles County has the opportunity to develop and implement a best practice model that can be replicated state wide, while complimenting other existing models in the nation.

Los Angeles

Within Los Angeles County, Probation and DCFS participate in a joint collaborative program that models what may be incorporated into a more comprehensive plan of services for the CSEC population, the Los Angeles County Multi-Agency Response Team (MART). This team is comprised of agency representatives from: Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Homeland Security/Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Special Victims unit, Parole, Probation, and the DCFS MART emergency response unit. This joint response team was originally developed to address Gang and Drug Suppression efforts, Parole and Probation sweeps, and response to Methadone labs.

For example, in January 2013, the Los Angeles County Multi-Agency Response Team (MART) conducted a safety sweep of a location identified as a known prostitution track in an attempt to rescue any identified CSEC victims. This effort resulted in the arrest of 30 adults and a safe rescue of two CSEC victims. While this effort was successful, the team's competing original mandate is their primary focus and more work is needed to build capacity within community and county agencies to provide the on-going services needed for these youth and their families.

IV. Recommendations and Next Steps

Los Angeles County needs a countywide, comprehensive, coordinated and strategic response model for CSEC victims.

Since both Probation and DCFS are key agencies for leading this necessary endeavor, it is recommended that Los Angeles County develop and implement the following strategies for responding to CSEC cases:

- 1) A countywide interagency protocol for responding to CSEC cases;
- 2) Development of a risk-assessment tool to strategically plan to address service needs of the victims.
- 3) Training for DCFS, Probation, and other key provider agencies regarding the proposed strategic response;
- 4) Data collection and analysis regarding the proposed countywide response, and
- 5) A final report on the results and sustainability of the proposed project.

In order to support county departments and key stakeholder agencies with the above tasks, it is recommended that expert CSEC consultants from both JPG Consultants and the National Center for Youth Law (NCYL) be utilized to work closely with DCFS, Probation and other identified county agencies. Please see attached proposal, work scope, and draft timeline for more information on the proposed project.

V. Acknowledgements

The efforts of the Task Force and project proposal have been adopted by the Child Welfare Council, the CSEC Action Team, chaired by Secretary Dooley and Leslie Heimov, Executive Director of the Children's Law Center of California. Leslie Heimov is an active participant of the Los Angeles CSEC Task Force and has been instrumental in the on-going efforts of the Task Force. It is likely that Los Angeles County representatives will also be included in the State CSEC action team. Los Angeles County will continue in its efforts to assist the State in the further development of its reform efforts as outlined in the attached Project Plan of action from the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA).

This report and related recommendations would not have been possible without the partnership, information, and experience of the following key agencies that participated in the Task Force and contributed to this report:

- The Association of Community Human Service Agencies (ACHSA) Alliance for Children's Rights
- Aviva Center
- Children's Law Center
- Children's Service Commission
- Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (CAST)
- Department of Children and Family Services: MART, ROU, Court Services and Clinical Resources
- Department of Mental Health
- Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Foster Family Agency (FFA) Homes
- Long Beach Task Force on Human Trafficking
- Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
- Los Angeles Police Department
- Los Angeles County Probation Department
- Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Mary Magdalene Project
- National Center for Youth Law (NCYL)
- Private Investigators/Defense Counsel
- Runaway Girl
- Saving Innocence
- Superior Court of Los Angeles County
- YWCA of Greater Los Angeles

Thanks to Kate Walker and NCYL for authoring the Child Welfare Council Report that provided invaluable guidance for a multi-system response to CSEC in Los Angeles County. We also want to acknowledge Angela Chung and the staff of CAST, Kim Biddle of Saving Innocence, and Leslie Heimov and her staff from CLC, for their participation, guidance, and engagement in the Task Force. We are also extremely grateful for the leadership of Task Force co-chairs, Michelle Guymon of Probation and Roberta Medina of DCFS. This Task Force provided a necessary venue to identify key information and partnerships that will set the foundation for a strategic response to this challenge. It also proved that there are many amazing agencies and individuals that will remain committed and provide support to this important effort. We thank everyone for their involvement and collaboration, and look forward to the continued support for this necessary endeavor.

Attachments:

- (1) Proposal for Developing a Coordinated Response Model for CSEC Cases in Los Angeles County
- (2) Draft Work Scope and Time Line for Proposed Project
- (3) Child Welfare Council – CSEC ACTION PROJECT PLAN

PLB:JP
KW:JPG
MG:RM

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Chief Executive Officer
County Counsel

Proposal for Coordinated CSEC Response Model for Los Angeles County

A. Background

The commercial sexual exploitation of children is a growing problem across the state of California and nationally. The FBI estimates that 100,000 children are sold for sex each year within the United States, and the FBI has identified Los Angeles as a major hub for child sex trafficking. Los Angeles has begun developing supports and services around this population, but has encountered a number of challenges in identifying and serving them. Specifically, the county has no mechanism to systematically identify youth who have been exploited, and often, it is not until a youth is arrested for prostitution or a prostitution-related offense that they are identified as a victim. Protocols guiding first responders on steps to take when they encounter CSEC and at-risk youth do not exist. Data is not currently collected across systems in a coordinated manner, and there is still general lack of training and awareness on this issue among the child-serving systems. Additionally, a majority of the current services and supports can only be accessed through the juvenile justice system. Below are the key components necessary to develop and implement a coordinated, multi-agency response to the growing problem of commercial sexual exploitation in Los Angeles County.

The components described closely parallel the recommendations adopted by the California Child Welfare Council and outlined in the report “Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: A Call for a Multi-System Collaboration in California.” This proposed project would also ensure that any legislative changes and mandates are integrated as necessary.

B. Key Components to Create A Multi-System, Coordinated Response to CSEC Cases in Los Angeles County

- 1) **Advisory body/Steering committee** consisting of necessary parties/stakeholders that will ensure agencies are engaged, provide necessary feedback, and eventually sign off on the county-wide memorandum of understanding. Since LA County data has confirmed that the majority of CSEC youth are systems-involved and have significant histories in both Child Welfare and Probation, both DCFS and Probation are the recommended lead agencies for recommended jurisdictional response to CSEC cases.
 - a. The following parties must be involved in the initial planning to garner support, set priorities, ensure engagement, and better serve commercially sexually exploited and at risk children and their families or caregivers:
 - i. Child Welfare
 - ii. Probation
 - iii. Behavioral Health Care
 - iv. Physical Health Care
 - v. Education
 - vi. Law enforcement
 - vii. Courts, including court officers, Public Defenders, District Attorneys, and Dependency Attorneys (the Child’s attorney)

- viii. Providers (placements, CSEC specialized providers, etc.)
- ix. Survivors

2) Memorandum of Understanding

a. Memorialize the *goals and priorities* of a county-wide response to CSEC

i. Identification:

1. Provide training to agencies and county-contracted providers that interface with children who are at risk or have been commercially sexually exploited on how to identify and engage potential victims.
2. Identify and Utilize tools for use by Probation, DCFS and other county-contracted agencies that are designed to facilitate the identification and assessment of needs of this population.
 - a. Screening tool will provide a mechanism for systematic identification of CSEC and at-risk youth.
 - b. Assessment tool gathers information on the youth's needs and strengths to better serve and support youth.

ii. Response:

1. Develop a county-wide response to serve commercially sexually exploited or at risk children once they have been identified.
2. The response will provide guidance on engagement strategies, referrals, and techniques to serve and support commercially sexually exploited and at-risk children and their families or caregivers.
 - a. For example, guidance for agency partners will provide instruction and "marching orders" from the point a youth interfaces with a partner, to investigation, to linkages to services.

iii. Data Collection, Information Sharing & Analysis:

1. Analyze existing data that relates to this population to inform priorities and goals moving forward.
2. Design protocols to ensure data is captured within the child-serving agencies that may interface with commercially sexually exploited and at risk children.
3. Utilize standardized screening and assessment tools across agencies to ensure uniformity in the data points collected.
4. Develop protocols to share information across systems that comply with privacy and confidentiality laws.
5. Develop structure for analyzing compiled data at individual case and aggregate level throughout project to ensure implementation of protocols is effective and improves outcomes of youth.

iv. Sustainability:

1. Design protocols and MOU to ensure the greatest likelihood of sustainability by engaging agencies and providers that have sustained funding, e.g. sexual assault/rape crisis response.
2. Protocols and MOU take into account diminishing likelihood of specialized grant funding for commercially sexually exploited

children and providers to ensure project and work is maintained beyond these specialized resources.

3. Develop training modules and conduct ‘train the trainer’ workshops to build capacity and sustainability.
- b. Memorialize the *roles and responsibilities* of each partner agency in the county-wide response to CSEC
 - i. Each partner agency and department will have defined roles and responsibilities to identify and respond to commercially sexually exploited and at risk children.
 - ii. By delineating roles and responsibilities, the MOU will ensure accountability among the partner agencies and providers.

3) **Internal Departmental Directives for both DCFS and Probation**

- a. Develop and memorialize internal department protocols for responding to CSEC cases in both DCFS and Probation
 - i. **Identification:** Develop protocols for all departments within each agency (DCFS and Probation) that interface with children who are at risk or have been commercially sexually exploited receive training and guidance on how to identify and engage potential victims of commercial sexual exploitation. The protocols will promote the use of tools that are identified for screening and assessment.
 - ii. **Response:** Develop departmental directives that outline a strategic and coordinated response to CSEC cases within each department of each agency.
 - iii. **Data Collection, Information Sharing & Analysis:** Develop data compilation and analysis strategy for evaluating implementation of proposed DCFS and Probation agency-wide responses to CSEC cases. Work with information sharing expert to ensure any information shared complies with confidentiality and privacy laws.
 - iv. **Sustainability:** Assist Probation and DCFS in identifying future revenue and sustainability for effectively responding to CSEC cases each agency.

4) **County-wide Trainings on Responding to CSEC Cases**

- a. Develop curricula to train Probation and DCFS, focusing on the recommended response detailed in the internal departmental directives outlined above.
 - i. Training will focus primarily on the county-wide response as opposed to general awareness of the issue of CSEC.
 - ii. Train workers that will likely be administering the screening and assessment tools to ensure they are sensitive the trauma experienced by these youth.

5) **Timelines** to ensure goals and objectives are met at the culmination of an 18-month period. Reports to the Board of Supervisors could also be scheduled at each ninety-day increment to report on progress and identify any roadblocks.

- a. Proposed timeline:
 - i. **0-3 Months:**

1. Convene identified stakeholder agencies regarding the proposed project to confirm partnership on proposed project
 2. Identify point people within each participating agency
 3. Finalize priorities for CSEC county-wide response
 4. Review partner and departmental agency data, policy and procedures for CSEC cases, and
 5. Provide mapping/gaps analysis of current departmental/county response to CSEC cases.
- ii. **3-6 Months:**
1. Convene partner agencies and Board of Supervisors (BOS) to review mapping/gap analysis,
 2. Consult with each agency to develop recommended protocols for responding to CSEC cases within its department and protocols and guidance when a case necessitates interfacing with other agencies,
 3. Draft county-wide MOU and flow chart providing directions and guidance on how to respond to CSEC cases
 4. Draft CSEC internal protocols for both DCFS and Probation
 5. Begin to develop training curricula for Probation and DCFS
- iii. **6-9 Months:**
1. Convene partner agencies and BOS regarding recommended protocols for responding to CSEC in LA County
 2. Ensure each participating agency reviews, vets, refines and signs off on their role in recommended county-wide response to CSEC cases memorialized in draft MOU
 3. Complete and start implementing draft protocols/MOU for responding to CSEC cases
 4. Complete check list/step-by-step guidance for each agency for responding to CSEC cases
 5. Complete training curricula for Probation and DCFS on county-wide response to CSEC cases
- iv. **9-12 Months:**
1. Convene stakeholder agencies to review working document and strategy for implementing recommended protocols
 2. Conduct training for Probation and DCFS on CSEC response
 3. Review data and information resulting from implementation of protocols
 4. Refine final protocols to reflect information attained during implementation
- v. **12-18 Months:**
1. Continue to review data and information resulting from implementation of protocols
 2. Continue to refine final internal protocols for Probation and DCFS
 3. Further refine and finalize MOU for all agencies to sign
 4. Convene BOS and Partner Agencies to sign final MOU and present final report on project

C. Proposed Work Scope for Project

Attached is the draft work scope for the proposed project. The work scope outlines areas related to the required **identification and response** of each key agency that interfaces with CSEC cases in Los Angeles County. Key products that will result from the work scope include:

- 1) A county-wide and multi-agency MOU for responding to CSEC cases;
- 2) Internal departmental directives for both Probation and DCFS for responding to CSEC cases;
- 3) Training for DCFS, Probation, and other key agencies regarding the proposed strategic response;
- 4) Data collection and analysis regarding the proposed county-wide response, and
- 5) A final report on the results and sustainability of the proposed project. This work scope and timeline will be further refined once the project officially commences.

In order to support county departments and key stakeholder agencies in work related to the proposed project, it is recommended that expert consultants on CSEC from both JPG Consultants and National Center for Youth Law (NCYL) be utilized for this necessary endeavor.

Julie Posadas Guzman, J.D. of JPG Consultants has over twenty years of experience in assisting jurisdictions throughout California (including Alameda, San Francisco, and Contra Costa Counties) to develop model protocols, programming, and strategic responses to system involved youth and the growing epidemic of child sex trafficking. Before starting her consulting firm in 2009, she was Director of Girls Services for the San Francisco Probation Department and a victim advocate with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, specializing in child sexual assault cases. Ms. Posadas Guzman is the recommended lead consultant on this project for working with Probation, law enforcement agencies, first responder organizations, and the Courts regarding their involvement in the MOU and other related work products. She is currently contracted with the Los Angeles County Probation Department to provide this service.

The National Center for Youth Law (NCYL) will also play a key role in the proposed project. Kate Walker, attorney and Equal Justice Works Fellow at NCYL, is a substantive expert on the intersection of the growing problem of commercial sexual exploitation and the child welfare system. Ms. Walker has been involved in statewide work with the California Child Welfare Council, and wrote a comprehensive report that is being used as the cornerstone of a state project to better serve and support commercially sexually exploited and at risk children through the child welfare system. The report entitled, "Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: A Call for a Multi-System Collaboration in California," provides recommendations that closely parallel the components in this project proposal. Walker has also established relationships with jurisdictions that have adopted child welfare led approaches to combatting the commercial sexual exploitation of children. Rebecca Gudeman, senior attorney at the NCYL, will provide substantive expertise in the areas of information sharing and minor consent and confidentiality law. Fiza Quraishi, staff attorney at NCYL has worked on reform efforts related to systems-involved and crossover youth, and has substantive expertise in juvenile justice, child welfare and mental health. It is recommended that NCYL be the lead consultant for interfacing with DCFS on the proposed project.

Attachment: Draft Grid of Work Scope and Time Line for Proposed Project

Draft Work Scope and Timeline for Developing an Identification and Response Model for CSEC Cases in Los Angeles County

Agency	Identification	Response	Products (with next 18 months)	Lead Consultant
Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When referred by LE When referred by Court In Custody/ On Probation ID of boys as CSEC ID of youth as exploiters ID of adults as exploiters Assessment of CSEC Assessment of Adult HT Victim on Adult Probation Assessment of Youth Exploiter Assessment of Adult Exploiter Data Compilation re: identification strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSEC on Probation CSEC In Custody CSEC at Camps CSEC in Placement CSEC in STAR Court CSEC in 241.1 Hearings CSEC on Probation that are VW in HT Cases HT Victims on Adult Probation Exploiters on Juvenile Probation Exploiters on Adult Probation When CSEC goes missing Aftercare/Transitional Services Data Analysis Re: Response 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Department Directives Role in Multi-Agency MOU DMST Unit Manual Case Management Model for STAR Court Diversion Program Model (241.1) Data Analysis of Identification and Response Departmental Training on Response Model 	JPG Consultants
DCFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When referred by LE When referred by Court When referred by CPS By Social Workers ID of family member as exploiter Assessment of CSEC Assessment of family member as exploiter Data compilation re: Identification strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within each DCFS Unit CPS Response (general calls and MR calls – f/u with law enforcement) Command/Receiving Center At DCFS Placements CSEC in 241.1 Hearings CSEC that are VW in HT Cases When CSEC goes missing Aftercare/Transitional Services CSEC with Children CSEC Programming Data Compilation & Response 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Department Directives Role in Multi-Agency MOU Data Analysis of Identification and Response Departmental Training on Response Model 	Kate Walker/NCYL



JPG CONSULTANTS

Agency	Identification	Response	Products (with next 18 months)	Lead Consultant
Law Enforcement (LAPD, Sheriff, other LE agencies within jurisdiction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During CSEC Operations • ID of boys as CSEC • ID of youth as exploiters • ID of adults as exploiters • Needs Assessment of Identified CSEC • Data compilation re: Identification strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interface with Probation • Interface with DCFS • Interface with First Responder/Advocacy • Interface with DA • When Identified CSEC goes missing • Data compilation of response strategies • Safety Plan for CSEC as VW 	1) Role in Multi-Agency MOU	JPG Consultants Kate Walker/ NCYL on interface with DCFS and when CSEC goes missing
District Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When referred by LE • When referred by Probation • When referred by DCFS • When referred by Court • Data Compilation of Identification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols for Responding to CSEC Cases (Juvenile and Adult) • Protocols for Responding to CSEC as VW in HT Proceeding • DA Diversion Program • Data Compilation of Response • Safety Plan for CSEC as VW 	1) Role in Multi-Agency MOU 2) Recommendations for VW Protocols in Human Trafficking Cases	JPG Consultants Kate Walker/ NCYL if VW involved with DCFS
School District (LA County School District, School at Probation Hall/Camps, other school districts within jurisdiction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID of youth as CSEC • ID of youth as exploiters • ID of adults as exploiters (on or near campus) • Data Compilation of Identification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol for identifying CSEC students • Protocol for supporting CSEC students • Safety Protocol to prevent/respond to recruiting on campus • Teacher training • Student training • Mandated Reporter Requirements 	1) Role in Multi-Agency MOU	TBD There will likely be some element of that Kate Walker/ NCYL for the CSEC students who are foster children



Agency	Identification	Response	Products (with next 18 months)	Lead Consultant
First Responder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID and assessment of referred youth <p><u>Referrals may come from:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LE Probation DCFS Courts DA Youth/Family Other Agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When interfacing with CSEC When interfacing with LE When interfacing with Probation When interfacing with DCFS When interfacing with DA When interfacing with Courts When interfacing with other First Responder/Advocates Mandated Reporter Requirements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Role in Multi-Agency MOU Protocol Recommendations for interfacing with key agencies re: FR/A List of FR/Advocacy Organizations Training on FR/Advocacy Response Model 	JPG Consultants Kate Walker/ NCYL when interfacing with DCFS, Mandated Reporter Requirements, possibly with courts
CSEC Providers / Community Orgs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID of youth as CSEC ID of youth as exploiters ID of adults as exploiters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for identifying CSEC in program Training for responding to CSEC in program Safety Protocol to prevent/respond to recruiting in program Mandated Reporter Requirements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Role in Multi-Agency MOU ? Diversion Program Model (241.1) Resource List of CSEC Providers in LA County 	JPG Consultants (Probation) Kate Walker/NCYL (DCFS)
Courts (Adult and Juvenile)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID of youth as CSEC ID of youth as exploiters ID of adults as exploiters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Dependency Proceedings In Delinquency Proceedings When CSEC is a VW in a HT Proceeding 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Role in Multi-Agency MOU 	JPG Consultants Kate Walker/ NCYL in dependency proceedings
County Medical Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID of youth as CSEC ID of youth as exploiters ID of adults as exploiters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At Emergency Rooms When providing medical treatment (non-emergency) Forensic examinations Confidentiality Issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Role in Multi-Agency MOU 	TBD



CONSULTANTS

Agency	Identification	Response	Products (with next 18 months)	Lead Consultant
County Mental Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID of youth as CSEC • ID of youth as exploiters • ID of adults as exploiters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When providing mental health services • Confidentiality Issues 	1) Role in Multi-Agency MOU	TBD
Public Defender/Defense Counsel/Dependency Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID Client as CSEC in juvenile dependency proceedings • ID Client as CSEC in juvenile delinquency proceedings • ID Client as HT victim in adult proceedings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In dependency proceedings • In delinquency proceedings • Assisting CSEC client to surrender for bench/probation warrants • When client is a VW in HT case • When client is a defendant in HT case • Conflict of interest issues • Confidentiality issues 	1) Role in Multi-Agency MOU	TBD
Other Agencies (TBD)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD



JPG CONSULTANTS

0-3 Months	3-6 Months	6-9 Months	9-12 Months	12-18 Months
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene identified partner agencies to confirm partnership on proposed project Identify point person for each participating agency Finalize priorities for CSEC county-wide response Review partner and departmental agency data, policy, and procedures for CSEC cases Provide mapping/gaps analysis of current departmental /county response to CSEC cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene partner agencies and BOS to review mapping/gaps analysis for CSEC response Consult with each identified agency to develop recommended protocols for responding to CSEC cases and guidance where a cases necessitates interfacing with other agencies Draft county-wide MOU and flow chart for responding to CSEC cases Draft CSEC internal protocols for Probation and DCFS Begin to develop training curricula for Probation and DCFS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene partner agencies/BOS regarding recommended protocols for responding to CSEC in LA County Ensure each participating agency reviews, vets, refines and signs off on their role in recommended county-wide response to CSEC cases memorialized in draft MOU Complete and start implementing draft MOU for responding to CSEC cases Complete check list/step by step guidance for each agency responding to CSEC cases Complete training curriculum for both departmental (Probation, DCFS) and county-wide response to CSEC Cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene stakeholder agencies to review draft MOU and strategy for implementing recommended protocols Conduct agency training (DCFS, Probation) for responding to CSEC cases Review data and information resulting from implementation of protocols Refine final protocols to reflect information attained during implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to review data and information resulting from implementation of protocols Continue to refine final protocols to reflect information attained from implementation stage Create final MOU for all agencies to sign off on Convene BOS/Partner Agencies for review of final report, sign off on final MOU

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
COMMERCIALLY SEXUALLY EXPLOITED CHILDREN (CSEC) ACTION PROJECT
PROJECT PLAN: ACTION ITEM FOR JUNE 5, 2013 COUNCIL MEETING

Background. Building on the research presented in the report, *“Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: A Call for Multi-System Collaboration in California,”* the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) Workgroup identified a series of recommendations to address the issue. These recommendations are based on three key premises:

- (1) Many children involved in the child welfare system are at risk of commercial sexual exploitation and an unknown number are being exploited;
- (2) Action by the child welfare system in collaboration with other child-serving agencies and organizations could prevent exploitation and aid victims;
- (3) Building on the collaborative strength of the Child Welfare Council, a CSEC Action Project would provide a leadership opportunity to implement a coordinated plan that empowers agencies and organizations to take action to reduce exploitation and protect and treat victims.

Upon approval by the Child Welfare Council of the Global Recommendation, the CSEC Action Team will immediately begin implementing the recommendations to address the needs of CSEC and those at risk of sexual exploitation.

GLOBAL RECOMMENDATION

Launch the CSEC Action Project to implement the recommendations
and secure funding to carry out this work.

Because public systems face many challenges in formulating an effective response to child sex trafficking, a comprehensive and coordinated approach is needed. Therefore, the CSEC Workgroup’s overarching recommendation is that the Child Welfare Council launch the CSEC Action Project to improve California’s response to commercial sexual exploitation of children. The CSEC Action Team will facilitate implementation of the recommendations in four focus areas: *Prevalence and Identification, Specialized Services, Prevention and Training, and Multi-System and Data Coordination*. These focus areas are described in further detail under “Specific Recommendations” below.

Vision. When the recommendations outlined in this plan are fully implemented, CSEC and at-risk children who are involved with the child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems (e.g. mental and physical health, education, the courts, nonprofit providers, etc.) will be identified, cared for, protected, and receive the services they need to overcome trauma and thrive.

Proposed Structure. The Project will be coordinated by a CSEC Action Team under the auspices of the Child Welfare Council. The Team will be co-convened by the Secretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency and a community-based advocacy organization representative who has experience working with exploited children. Membership will include state and local government agency leaders, CSEC service providers, CSEC survivors, youth, CSEC advocates, court representatives, and other stakeholders.

Role. The Team will be charged with further developing and implementing the recommendations adopted by the Child Welfare Council and delineated in this Project Plan. Its work will be guided by the *Ending the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children* report and the following principles:

- 1) Essential to the project’s success will be the involvement of CSEC survivors, at-risk youth, and their families or caregivers.

- 2) The Team will need to build effective partnerships with State and local agencies and service providers, as these will be central players in the implementation of CSEC programs, services, supports, and prevention efforts.
- 3) Addressing CSEC issues and the needs of exploited youth will require a coordinated, comprehensive approach. Therefore, the Team will need to establish a structure and tools to support multi-system collaboration.

Process and Methods. To implement a comprehensive multi-system response to the commercial sexual exploitation of children in California, the CSEC Action Team’s methodology may include:

- Develop specific plans for each of the four focus areas, further developing and refining the strategies in this document and determining the sequencing of the strategies.
- Assess the current landscape of programs, services, and supports for CSEC children in California; identify gaps in current services and elements needed to address the needs of CSEC and at-risk youth.
- Research promising policies and practices in California and other states, and recommend how they can be implemented systematically on a local or statewide basis.
- Collaborate with stakeholders, including state and local agencies and service providers, to develop implementation timelines, lead agency responsibility and accountability, etc.
- Monitor progress, measure outcomes, and evaluate the effectiveness of the actions taken to address CSEC issues and the needs of CSEC and at-risk youth in California.

Funding. The urgency of CSEC issues in California justifies dedicated funding to support the CSEC Action Team’s work, including support from government agencies and philanthropic foundations. This funding should provide for a CSEC Action Project Director, expert resources to establish the multi-system collaborative infrastructure and conduct project management and evaluation, and stipends to enable CSEC survivors and other youth to be full participants in the process.

FOCUS AREAS AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The CSEC Workgroup’s recommendations fall into the following four focus areas:

- 1) ***Prevalence and Assessment.*** In order to understand the scope and nature of the problem in California and provide appropriate services, screen all children across systems for exploitation and risk factors and assess their CSEC-related needs on an ongoing basis.
- 2) ***Prevention and Training.*** Establish programs to prevent commercial sexual exploitation of children, and train child-serving professionals to understand the CSEC problem, how to identify CSEC and at-risk children, and how to provide or refer to appropriate services.
- 3) ***Specialized Services.*** Develop and provide specialized services that will enable CSEC children to be safe, overcome trauma and thrive.
- 4) ***Multi-System and Data Coordination.*** Establish and support a systematic approach to multi-systems coordination, including strategies to improve service delivery to CSEC and at-risk children and enable the collection and sharing of data.

Within these focus areas, the following pages present specific recommendations including:

- Immediate Actions to be taken within the first year of the project, with regular status reports to the Child Welfare Council.
- Longer-Term Strategies that the CSEC Action Team will further develop and expand upon in the subsequent years, also with regular status reports to the Child Welfare Council.

1. PREVALENCE AND ASSESSMENT

In order to understand the scope and nature of the problem in California and provide appropriate services, screen children across systems and assess their CSEC-related needs on an ongoing basis.

Immediate Action

- *Prevalence:* Conduct an initial assessment to gauge the prevalence of CSEC in child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems:
 - Work with professionals in these systems to assess prevalence among the children and youth they currently serve.
 - Coordinate a systematic review of case files using a proven sampling protocol.
 - Conduct database mining and analysis of compiled data in child-serving systems.
- *Assessment:* Identify the best available screening/assessment tools, undertake an initial effort to disseminate their use among child-serving systems, and gather information regarding needed adaptations and improvements.

Longer-Term Strategies

- 1) *Prevalence:* Continuously update information regarding the scope and nature of the CSEC problem.
 - Support the establishment of data sharing agreements to allow for compilation of information about CSEC prevalence in the child welfare population and other systems.
 - Support the development and implementation of a coordinated system for collection and analysis of prevalence data.
 - Review existing reporting processes, protocols, and mandates.
 - Explore options to maximize identification and reporting of CSEC and at-risk children across child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems.
 - Support implementation of a coordinated system that provides a clear understanding of victims' trajectory through the systems and how to address the needs of at-risk and CSEC children.
 - Periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the data collection/analysis system and identify needed improvements.
- 2) *Assessment:* Implement screening and assessment tools to properly identify all CSEC and at-risk children and address their needs on an ongoing basis.
 - Identify or develop multi-system screening and assessment tools that identify CSEC and at-risk children, evaluate their needs, indicate how well those needs are being met, enhance service delivery decision-making, and inform policymaking.
 - Support the implementation of screening/assessment protocols across child-serving agencies to systematically identify CSEC and at-risk children, and to assess their needs.
 - Adapt protocols for various CSEC populations and child-serving professionals (e.g., child welfare workers, probation officers, educators, health and mental health providers, etc.) to ensure screens and assessments are administered.
 - Continuously evaluate screening/assessment tools and protocols, and revise them based on quantitative and qualitative results.

2. Prevention and Training

Establish programs to prevent commercial sexual exploitation of children, and train child-serving professionals to understand the CSEC problem, identify CSEC and at-risk children, and provide or refer to appropriate services.

Immediate Action

- Make CSEC training available (how to identify CSEC and at-risk children, how to refer to/provide CSEC services, etc.) for professionals in child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems.

Longer-Term Strategies

- 1) *Prevention*: establish statewide and local prevention programs that will reduce the number of vulnerable children that are exploited.
 - Support the establishment and implementation of guidelines on appropriate placement and services strategies for children at risk of exploitation in child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems.
 - Support the development and distribution of youth-friendly materials to youth who come in contact with child welfare and other systems to inform them about healthy relationships, the dynamics of commercial sexual exploitation, and strategies to avoid recruitment.
 - Support the development and distribution of informational materials for parents and other caregivers regarding CSEC, including what they can do to prevent youth in their care from becoming CSEC victims, and steps to take if they suspect a youth is being exploited.
 - On a semi-annual basis, evaluate the effectiveness of the prevention, awareness and training strategies, with recommendations for improvement.
- 2) *Training*: ensure that professionals in child-serving systems understand the CSEC problem, how to identify CSEC and at-risk children, and how to provide or refer children to appropriate services
 - Support the development and dissemination of youth-friendly programs to engage and educate youth at risk of exploitation:
 - Ensure that programs and materials are sensitive to the issues and needs of CSEC children, cultural differences, gender identity, and sexual orientation.
 - Incorporate or adapt existing CSEC specialized programs and materials (e.g. the “My Life, My Choice” curriculum, GEMS CSEC 101, OJJDP Training on CSEC, etc.).
 - Develop models and protocols for providing ongoing training, coaching and mentoring for professionals and caregivers who serve CSEC and at-risk youth on a regular basis at all levels—from managers to line staff.
 - Develop a train-the-trainer series for child-serving systems in state and county agencies, particularly child welfare, covering the spectrum of CSEC topics, for example:
 - Risk factors and warning signs of CSEC victimization.
 - Screening and investigating CSEC incidents involving parents, foster parents, guardians, other caregivers, and third parties and the criteria for assessing the ongoing safety of the child.

- Strategies to engage youth and connect them with appropriate services and supports.
 - The resources, services, and supports available to meet the needs of CSEC and at-risk children and their families or caregivers.
- For caregivers and administrators in out-of-home care settings that serve youth, develop strategies to ensure that they receive training in advance of placement of CSEC and at-risk children, as well as ongoing training and coaching during the course of serving those children.
- Engage educators and schools to increase awareness of CSEC, and train teachers, counselors, and administrators to identify, report, and work with CSEC children, at-risk youth, and their families.
- Support the development and delivery of specialized training on risk factors, warning signs, and the dynamics of exploitation for professionals in child-serving systems, such as juvenile courts (dependency attorneys, district attorneys, public defenders, county counsel, judges, probation officers, etc.) and professionals who regularly come into contact with CSEC and at-risk children (health care providers, mental health clinicians, etc.).
 - Identify and initially focus on high-priority areas and systems of higher risk (e.g. group homes, schools in impoverished areas where the sex trade thrives, etc.).
 - Focus the specialized training for practitioners on practical tools and skills in identifying CSEC and at-risk youth, and addressing the needs of this population.
- On a semi-annual basis, evaluate the effectiveness of the prevention, awareness and training strategies, with recommendations for improvement.

3. SPECIALIZED SERVICES

Develop and provide specialized services that will enable CSEC children to be safe, overcome trauma and thrive.

Immediate Action

- *Placement:* Work with county child welfare and probation systems and service providers to increase the availability of safe, protected, and appropriate emergency and longer-term placements for CSEC.

Longer-Term Strategies

- 3) *Specialized Services:* establish a continuum of safe and protected placement options and a coordinated system of specialized services that will enable CSEC children and their families or caregivers to overcome trauma and thrive.
 - Work with state and local officials and service providers to ensure that emergency housing is available to meet the needs of CSEC and at-risk children.
 - Further define the need for various kinds of transition and longer-term placements, facilities, services, and supports for CSEC children, including safe and protected facilities.
 - Work with state and local agencies to assess the availability of these needed placements, facilities, services and supports throughout California, and identify areas where there is a large gap between need and availability.
 - Drawing upon effective models, develop a continuum of care model for CSEC and at-risk children in California (e.g., case management, mental and physical health services, respite care, crisis response, specialized legal services, educational assistance, vocational training, etc.).
 - Support the establishment and implementation of guidelines on appropriate placement and services strategies for CSEC children in child welfare, juvenile justice, and other child-serving systems.
 - Ensure that policies and protocols for those working with CSEC children include a focus on understanding and respecting victims' culture, gender, and sexual orientation.
 - On a semi-annual basis, conduct an assessment of the availability of placement options and specialized services, an evaluation of the effectiveness of those services, and provide recommendations for improvement.
- 4) *Policy and Legislation:* Identify opportunities to improve coordination and access to services for CSE and at-risk children through policy and legislative changes.
 - Analyze pending legislation and identify opportunities to advance strategies to address CSEC issues and enhance services for CSEC and at-risk children.
 - Study other states' laws designed to serve CSEC victims, including Safe Harbor and diversion laws, and make recommendations regarding steps California can take to strengthen its policies.
 - Assess potential policy changes to decriminalize CSEC based on their status as crime victims, in consultation with the Attorney General and the California District Attorneys Association.

- Analyze California victims' rights laws and how they pertain to CSEC; explore options for asserting any enumerated rights.

4. Multi-System and Data Coordination

Establish and support a systematic approach to multi-systems coordination, including strategies to improve service delivery to CSEC and at-risk children and enable the collection and sharing of data.

Immediate Action

- *Multi-System Coordination:* Develop cross-system mechanisms and infrastructure for collaboration among CSEC providers, public agencies, and other stakeholders, while building upon structures, processes, and relationships already in place.
- *Data:* Establish strategies to collect and share data consistent with privacy protections, at the individual child level, to promote coordination of services, and at the aggregate level, to quantify the scope and nature of the problem and track emerging trends.

Longer-Term Strategies

- 1) *Multi-System Coordination:* Implement and evaluate mechanisms and a structure for collaboration.
 - Develop a model and protocols to support multi-agency coordination, information sharing, and collaboration to identify and address the needs of CSEC and at-risk children.
 - Develop multi-system protocols to coordinate service delivery as appropriate among child welfare, probation, education, mental and physical health, nonprofit providers, courts and other child-serving agencies, with full involvement of consumers in the process.
 - Continually monitor the efficacy of the protocols to identify areas for improving collaboration, and establish accountability measures to ensure that child-serving systems are addressing the needs of CSEC and at-risk children.
 - On a semi-annual basis, conduct an evaluation of the multi-system structure, protocols, and accountability measures. Include recommendations for improvement.
- 2) *Data:* Implement data sharing agreements that protect confidentiality while providing essential information to agencies and services providers at the individual level and that allow for data to be aggregated without client identifiers for program evaluation purposes.
 - Assess current data sharing agreements and proposed agreements among public health, education, and human services agencies and determine how they might support CSEC data sharing agreements, both at the individual and aggregate levels.
 - Develop model data-sharing agreements and other tools to improve information sharing, and encourage adoption across systems statewide.
 - Assess other improvements needed for effective data sharing (e.g. technology infrastructure, data compilation and analysis mechanisms, etc.) and support funding for and implementation of those improvements.
 - On a semi-annual basis, conduct an evaluation of data sharing and the usefulness of available data, including recommendations for improvement.