

Northwest University

Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in Del Norte County, California

Kimberly Williams

GLST 5972

Dr. Forrest Inslee

22 April 2018

Some material included in this thesis project was previously submitted to meet the requirements of the following ICD courses: Globalization and Development, Research for Social Change, Fieldwork, Leadership, Practicum III: Program Evaluation, Practicum IV: Thesis Project I, and Practicum V: Thesis Project II.

Thanks

I sincerely thank my Program Managers, Julie Cain and Crystal Nielsen, for supporting my academic research and the implementation of this CSEC project. We would not have made this progress without your support and dedication. As Program Managers, you are uniquely equipped to know the technical details of how to pull off the project, as well as the social, economic and political factors that play into the entire process (Diaz 13). I truly believe this project can make a positive impact in our community. You both should receive the recognition you deserve for implementing the CSEC Program in Del Norte County. Our community, our youth, and I all thank you in advance for the difference your work makes in our lives.

Table of Contents

THANKS.....	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
BACKGROUND	5
RESEARCH METHODS.....	11
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH FINDINGS	13
TRAINING.....	14
INTERAGENCY PROTOCOL AND TEAM.....	15
RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION.....	16
SOLUTION-FOCUSED.....	18
PROJECT.....	18
DISCUSSION.....	21
DATA COMPARISON.....	21
EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION	22
RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.....	23
STATE-WIDE APPLICATION.....	24
CONCLUSION	24
WORKS CITED.....	26
APPENDIXES.....	30

Introduction

Human trafficking is continually gaining attention in the United States and has become known as “modern day slavery.” We are beginning to understand that this is not just a big-city issue, but something that happens in our own backyards. A study by Yvonne Rafferty showed that although finding reliable statistics on the extent of human trafficking is virtually impossible, human trafficking is a global occurrence, where “no region of the world is free of the practice” (560-561). However, many people think that trafficking does not happen in their own communities (Torres).

Rural communities cannot properly identify and help Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) until they are aware the problem exists in their own communities, identify available resources, and establish an action plan. The County of Del Norte should work toward this goal by training county staff on the reality of trafficking in rural California, establishing an interagency protocol for working with this population, and identifying current assets and gaps in community resources to help these children. My thesis project will put these ideas into practice by developing a county plan and interagency protocol, bringing training to the staff and community members of Del Norte County, and identifying local resources for commercially sexually exploited children (see appendixes).

The practical goals of completing this thesis project are to understand the local perspective on Commercial Sexual Exploitation and to opt Del Norte County into the state-funded CSEC Program. Ultimately, the goal is to best serve local CSEC. My research began with interviewing employees of Del Norte County Child Welfare Services and reviewing the local statistics and policies for CSEC. At the time of this study, there were zero cases of identified CSEC in Del Norte County. This information causes many in the county to question why they

need to focus on this issue. My research led me to the conclusion that the main barriers to identifying CSEC locally are the lack of CSEC training and lack of resource identification to help potential CSEC.

For instance, as I sat in the office of Crystal Nielsen, a local Social Services Program Manager, I observed her access the information system to show me how it works. She wanted to pull up a case that she believed would have been under the CSEC Special Projects Code. However, when she found the case she was looking for, it had never been identified as a case of suspected CSEC. Although this finding was unexpected to her, it did not surprise me. I have researched local practices and perspectives on identifying CSEC cases and found that the total number of cases logged in the information system as suspected or confirmed CSEC is zero. I had to consider the possibility that there truly weren't any cases of CSEC in the community. However, as I talked with social workers and probation officers, I learned that there were multiple cases that could have been identified as suspected CSEC, but were not. Social Worker Supervisor Deidra Ward stated the reason is because the staff felt unsure of identifying the cases as such since they did not have the amount of proof or training that they would have liked. Mrs. Ward identified another barrier as staff not wanting to categorize a child as commercially sexually exploited because they do not know of local resources to help these children.

Background

I was born and raised in Crescent City, California, the seat of Del Norte County. I moved away for about a decade and worked with young women and girls brought out of human trafficking. I have since moved back to Crescent City and now work in the Department of Health and Human Services in Del Norte County. The leadership in the Department of Health and Human Services allowed me to conduct my thesis research with the Social Services Branch.

In my first official research interview, I realized the Department of Health and Human Services had been tasked with the difficult assignment of working with survivors of child trafficking. When I interviewed the Program Manager of Social Services, I asked if she was aware of the high correlation between foster youth and human trafficking. That is when she told me the department is supposed to develop an interagency protocol for responding to human trafficking (Cain). The specific term used by the State of California is Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, or CSEC. The simplified definition of commercial sexual exploitation is sex in exchange for anything of value. The state Child Welfare CSEC Action Team identifies child sex trafficking, child pornography, and child sex tourism as CSEC problems both domestically and internationally. Many people would agree child trafficking is a terrible thing that happens in the world, but also need to recognize the truth in the statement, “While human rights are formalized at the international level, they are first and foremost at the local level” (Lechner and Boli 329).

The United States Department of State defines “trafficking in persons” and “human trafficking” as “umbrella terms for the act of recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing, or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud, or coercion.” This document clarifies, “Human trafficking can include but does not require movement” (US Department of State). This last statement is important in identifying Commercially Sexually Exploited Children. CSEC cases do not have to involve a teenage girl who is being moved from city to city, a popular perception of sex trafficking. A victim of commercial sexual exploitation can be a young boy whose father is making money from his sexual exploitation in his own home. A victim of commercial sexual exploitation can be a vulnerable youth who trades sex to meet basic needs.

One might suggest that if a minor is “willingly trading” sex for survival needs, perhaps this isn’t exploitation. The United States Department of State specifies, “When a minor is induced to perform a commercial sex act, proving force, fraud, or coercion against their pimp is not necessary for the offense to be characterized as human trafficking. There are no exceptions to this rule.”

Minors who solicited their bodies were considered criminals until September 26, 2016, when Senate Bill 1322 declared that minors will not be charged with prostitution-related crimes. These minors will be recognized as children who require protection and resources. As of January 1, 2017, law enforcement and Child Welfare Services must work together when a minor is found to be exploited. This mindset shift is vital. If minors cannot legally consent to sex, and an adult engaging in sexual activity with a minor is illegal, why were youth considered able to choose prostitution as a profession and placed in juvenile hall for criminal activity? These youth require a specific type of help from the community. As the US Department of State acknowledges, “Sex trafficking has devastating consequences for minors, including long-lasting physical and psychological trauma, disease (including HIV/AIDS), drug addiction, unwanted pregnancy, malnutrition, social ostracism, and even death.”

In 2014, Senate Bill 855 established that a Commercially Sexually Exploited Child whose parent or guardian failed to, or was unable to, protect the child may be placed in the care of the Child Welfare System. With the laws changing to protect minors, it is important to look at the implementation of such laws at the community level. In 2014 the State of California provided county Child Welfare Services departments funding to create a county-wide protocol for working with victims and survivors of child commercial sexual exploitation. The funds are to be used to educate the community, establish protocol, and incorporate an interagency team to respond to

CSEC in the local communities. As of August 2017, none of these funds have been used in Del Norte County.

Senate Bill 855 also created the state-funded CSEC Program in California, and beginning in 2015, counties wanting to receive annual CSEC funding were required to submit a County Plan and Interagency CSEC Protocol. As of April of 2017, when this thesis project began, Del Norte County had not established a county plan or CSEC protocol, was not pulling down state funds, and was not serving any youth identified as CSEC. Why isn't there a CSEC protocol in Del Norte County? As I have been told, it was never identified as a top priority (Davis). Why was it never a top priority? Perhaps the fact that county agencies are consistently operating with bare minimum staff is part of it. With the constant pressure to address current needs, there is little time to begin something new. Perhaps the fact that the county has not identified many cases of CSEC leads agency leaders to believe that they don't need to give limited resources to this topic. I chose to focus my thesis research on finding out what the CSEC situation looks like locally and how the community can help. I have been trained to think that human trafficking is a global atrocity. Solutions start at home and global change begins on the most local level (Groody 265).

Although child welfare agencies are mandated to respond to child sexual exploitation, few have specific trainings and protocols currently in place. Without comprehensive CSEC trainings across professions, CSEC youth are likely to go unidentified (Hartinger-Saunders et al. 203). Last year, Hartinger-Saunders, et al. conducted the first study to explore whether mandated reporters working with adolescent girls recognize sex trafficking and its risk factors. More than half of mandated reporters in the sample believed some adolescent girls choose to prostitute themselves, even though most know a minor is not legally able to make that choice.

Approximately twenty-five percent of the mandated reporters surveyed believed that child sex trafficking does not happen in their communities, and twenty-one percent believed that most prostituted children come into the United States from other nations. About one in ten believed that sexual exploitation refers to young children but not teens, and a similar number believed child sex trafficking is “blown out of proportion” in the United States (Hartinger-Saunders et al. 201). This study revealed that both a lack of training and an unbelief sex trafficking exists in local communities are factors which continue to place youth at risk for re-victimization. What this means is that minors are placed at risk for continual and repeated exploitation because staff have limited training and understanding of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. This study is vital to showing why Del Norte County needs training in the facts of commercial sexual exploitation of children. While it could be true that there are zero cases of CSEC in Del Norte County, it could also be true that children are at-risk of exploitation and no one is seeing it. It is better to minimize the risk of minors being exploited. There is an opportunity for training, protocol, and resource identification to decrease the risk of exploitation of local youth.

The Hartinger-Saunders, et al. study points out, “Currently, there is no uniform data collection system in place to track [CSEC] incidence across the United States. For this reason and others, there are no reliable estimates of sex trafficking victims in the United States” (195-196). However, studies suggest that as many as three hundred and fifty thousand youth are at risk of becoming victims of commercial sexual exploitation (McNeal and Walker 710-711).

Although not decisive as cause and effect, Commercial Sexual Exploitation (CSE) correlates strongly with some factors that Del Norte County has in excess. Two main factors that correlate with CSE are domestic violence and a child’s placement in foster homes, which are known as Resource Family Homes in the state of California. In recent years, Del Norte County

had one of the highest rates of children in foster care per capita in the state (Dillehay). Although it is difficult to obtain exact statistics, data indicates between fifty percent and eighty percent of Commercially Sexually Exploited Children in the state of California had previously been involved in the child welfare system (Child Welfare). The highest demographic targeted by traffickers is children in foster care, according to a recent study by New York State Offices of Children and Family Services, which estimated an even higher rate (eighty-five percent) of child trafficking victims had contact with the child welfare system (Harbert and Tucker-Tatlow). Due to these statistics, this topic is relevant in Del Norte County.

The second correlating factor with CSEC is domestic violence, of which Del Norte County has a high rate. The same tactics of coercive control in domestic abuse are ones being used in child trafficking (Walsh 225). Researchers have identified nine methods of abuse that intersect in cases of domestic violence and cases of human trafficking, and Walsh argued, “the exertion of power through coercive control is the unifying feature of abuse among perpetrators of domestic violence, trafficking, and pimping” (237-238).

My research on CSEC in Del Norte County revealed that there is an interest in receiving training on CSEC. However, it has not been a priority in the community because of the lack of identified CSEC cases, and the need for staff to meet other immediate needs. Hartinger-Saunders, et al. acknowledged a child welfare response to CSEC will not be easy without additional resources, and showed great agency insight when they argued the CSEC response would “inevitably tax a system already overburdened by high caseloads and high worker turnover. Until we make the child welfare system a priority for responding to [CSEC] across the United States, the well-being of children and youth will continue to be compromised” (203-204).

My project aims to identify and activate these resources so that Del Norte County is well-equipped to respond to local children at risk of, or involved in, human trafficking.

Research Methods

I partnered with the Del Norte County Department of Health and Human Services to conduct this research on CSEC. The research proposal was reviewed and approved by the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services, and my research was overseen by the Program Manager of the Social Services Branch. The research for this project took place from May of 2017 to August of 2017. While the Department of Health and Human Services was willing to help me in my academic endeavors, I sought also to use my research for practical implementation. While research offers knowledge to the researcher, a goal in any study is to give back to the community, the organization, and those interviewed (Sunstein and Chiseri-Strater, 118).

I used a qualitative research design to study the experiences and perspectives of the community regarding commercial sexual exploitation of children as well as ways to move toward a better future for local youth. I sought to understand what CSEC looks like locally, the needs of this specific population, and how the community can help. Qualitative research is a viable option for this because it provides descriptive data gathered through interviews, observation, and documents (Merriam and Tisdell 105). Qualitative data allows researchers to inquire about experience, behavior, opinion, values, feeling, knowledge, and background/demographics (Merriam and Tisdell 118). The nature of qualitative research is that the focus is on process, understanding, and meaning; the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis; the process is inductive; and the product is richly descriptive (Merriam and Tisdell 15).

To conduct this research, I used a semi-structured, in-person interview style. The semi-structured interview approach allows for flexibility within the interview to follow up on respondents' answers, rephrase questions or bring in new questions that are specific to the individual responding. This approach also allows for a conversational flow of the interview and for clarification of understanding. The hope is to gain as much detailed information as possible from the interview. Researchers interview people to find out what we cannot directly observe, and the purpose of interviewing is to understand the interviewee's perspective (Merriam and Tisdell 108) so that we can gain a clear picture of how each person thinks, feels and responds to the topic at hand.

Each interview was recorded then transcribed after completion. The interview respondents were selected through purposeful sampling, which means I selected a sample population from which I believed I could learn the most information on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in Del Norte County (Merriam and Tisdell 96). The criteria for the interview sample were those in the community with professional experience with the child welfare system. During the initial interviews, I used the snowball effect by asking each respondent if they know of anyone else who may be willing to provide their experiential knowledge for the research. Snowball sampling is perhaps the most common form of purposeful sampling and allows for myriad perspectives (Merriam and Tisdell 98).

As part of gathering information, I looked at aggregate data from the Child Welfare Services information system regarding any cases identified as CSEC. I also disbursed Asset Mapping documents both physically and electronically to all the local agencies I thought may offer resources beneficial to CSEC. This form was used to gather data on what resources and barriers the local community has. A copy of this form is attached in Appendix D.

Qualitative Research Findings

The interviews with local Child Welfare workers revealed that while some people believe there may be trafficking of children occurring here, there is no evidence recorded in the information system (Davis). There are six distinct categories for identifying CSEC, and all six categories have zero cases tracked. Data collection for the Del Norte County CSEC Plan shows the below information:

CSEC Victim During Care	CSEC Victim Before Care	CSEC Victim in Open Case not in FC	CSEC While AWOL	At Risk** of CSEC	Other- Please Specify
0	0	0	0	0	0

No one has any data on local CSEC. While some people believe it just doesn't happen here, others acknowledge this may be an overlooked situation in the community. I would agree with Deidra Ward, who stated, "They (CSEC victims) are here, we just don't know."

Only one person I interviewed stated clearly to me that trafficking doesn't happen here (Farren). A prominent leader in the community responded to my survey on the CSEC training with the following: "I think if CSEC was a significant issue in Del Norte County, we would have heard more about it. That being said, this training will help identify CSEC in a case so it can be addressed appropriately, that is, identifying the children as victims, not criminals." Leadership in the Probation Department told me probation officers haven't identified CSEC cases in juvenile hall because the youth are not forthcoming with information and it is difficult to obtain proof that the youth have been trafficked.

When I asked Child Welfare Social Worker Supervisor Deidra Ward about barriers to serving CSEC in the community she stated:

I think to be honest we're a little leery to identify someone as CSEC because there are no services for them except for just the acknowledgment that this child possibly is vulnerable in that area. Because we don't have anything in place. So I think that's probably one reason. And the second reason is we're just not trained in it. I think people just don't understand what's needed.

My theory is that the lack of data stems from a lack of training and resources. Training and resources both require funding, which is often an issue with county resources. The State of California offers CSEC funds for county use. However, the Department cannot utilize CSEC allocated funds until they show there are CSEC cases here. The community also cannot identify, nor help, this population if they do not know how. Therefore, Del Norte County will need to start with education. Specific areas of need identified in Del Norte County include training, an interagency protocol, and identification of local resources for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children.

Training. As my research revealed, training of local agency employees will be a top priority to identify and help victims of sexual exploitation. Of the six Asset Mapping forms returned to me, only one agency indicated their staff has current and ongoing CSEC training. Under the question of what training staff has received on CSEC, one organization listed "Minimal," one listed "Basic," one listed "Domestic Violence Certified" and one listed "Unsure." The sixth agency left that question blank. Two agencies listed "Training" as an organizational barrier to working with CSEC.

Since agency employees are often the first line of defense, how the employees respond to what they see is imperative. Interviews with county staff indicate staff members believe the prevalence of CSEC is low in this county. A great resource regarding the potential prevalence of CSEC in this community was a training by two survivors of the commercial sex industry who came to Del Norte County to train staff and community members on the issue of CSEC. One survivor trainer, Jessica Torres, emphasized that communities with demographics like Del Norte County tend to think trafficking “doesn’t happen here. I’m here to tell you this is where the money is!” The second young lady who came to train on CSEC, Monique Calderon, stated, “Poverty is your first exploiter. Poverty is your number one barrier.” Del Norte County has a high level of poverty, with twenty-nine percent of children in Del Norte County living below the poverty level (US Census). This percentage is almost twice the national average (CIA). In Del Norte County, over forty percent of households in which there is a single mother with minor children have an income below the poverty level (US Census).

These CSEC trainers also explained that when boys are left out of the equation, CSEC is further hidden in communities. Boys being sexually exploited are most often labeled as child abuse cases. Now that the community has this information and training, a hope is that children who come into contact with professional staff and community members will have their situations and needs identified according to their true story.

Interagency Protocol and Team. As Del Norte County works toward becoming funded by the State of California, they need to meet the state requirement to have an interagency protocol and team for responding to local CSEC. While the Child Welfare System is required to take the lead on these teams, they truly need the support and resources of myriad agencies. The Del Norte County Protocol for working with Commercially Sexually Exploited Children includes Child

Welfare Services, Probation Department, Mental Health Branch, Alcohol and Other Drugs Program, Public Health Branch, Del Norte County Sheriff's Office, and Del Norte County Unified School District. Community agencies will also be invited to partner in identifying resources for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children. It is imperative that every member of the protocol is actively engaged in helping CSEC.

Resource Identification. The Asset Mapping forms returned during the research phase identified some potential resources for CSEC in Del Norte County. Though none of the organizations listed programs specific to CSEC, there are county resources which can be used, or further developed, to help CSEC. Six agencies returned these forms, and the community-based resources have more training and resources for trafficked persons than the county-based resources. The community-based organizations with the most relevant resources are the North Coast Rape Crisis Team and Harrington House, which is the local domestic violence shelter.

The North Coast Rape Crisis Team is a great asset in Del Norte County. This organization offers a 24-hour hotline, counseling, accompaniment to legal and medical services, information, and referrals to outside resources. This organization can also serve youth who are not in the Child Welfare or Probation systems, which means their reach extends beyond youth in those systems. North Coast Rape Crisis Team should be invited to all interagency meetings regarding potential CSEC.

Harrington House, while maybe not suitable for housing minors, offers resources for potential CSEC. They serve all victims of sex trafficking, sexual assault, stalking and domestic violence. Their staff is certified in domestic violence training. As discussed above, domestic violence correlates strongly with human trafficking. Harrington House offers shelter, food, clothing, transportation, advocacy, restraining orders, and peer counseling groups.

Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation Community and Family Services serves tribal members and tribal families and is in the process of creating CSEC policies and protocols. Soroptimist International of Crescent City has the ability to support agencies which provide direct services to CSEC. Social Service's Wraparound program can work with families to provide support, resources, and case plans for CSEC or at-risk CSEC.

The Domestic Violence Task Force is also a resource in the community. Domestic violence and human trafficking intersect, and similar approaches can be taken to help people in both groups, "in the same way that progressive protocols and inter-institutional coordination improved responsiveness to domestic abuse cases, these could also facilitate victim protection and case processing for sex trafficking cases" (Walsh 237). Domestic Violence Task Force members will be invited to share their insight into this developing program as well as any future cases of CSEC. The local Domestic Violence Task Force should be aware of the correlation between domestic violence and human trafficking, as well as the option for similar styles of treatment programs. Del Norte County is reworking the local domestic violence programs, and this information should be considered during that process.

A potentially great asset for CSEC is foster homes for trafficked minors. A case study on CSEC in Sacramento, California found that the "biggest limitation was lack of specialized placements, including specially trained trauma-informed group homes and/or foster homes" (Liles et al. 243). Due to findings such as this, the State of California is now in the beginning stages of finding a proper housing solution for children brought out of commercial sexual exploitation. The government is a great asset but it is not a good parent, so these kids need better options (Nielsen). The Resource Family Approval staff are included in CSEC trainings, and hope to collaborate on finding the right placements for trafficked minors identified in the future.

Solution-Focused

As I work toward creating a community coalition to effectively address commercial sexual exploitation of children in my local community, I want to help implement a program that works, that the community helps design, and that takes into account the wisdom of previous research. Del Norte County can decide local policy, and the decision-making should continually move toward the people most affected by them (Lechner and Boli 594). I hope the wisdom I have gained in this research project will truly help youth in the local community. While it seems overwhelming to focus on the issue of human trafficking, it is more hopeful to focus our minds and efforts on a solution. How can we help? This is where the project comes into play.

Project

This project includes three aspects: developing a county plan and interagency protocol, bringing training to the staff and community members of Del Norte County, and identifying local resources for commercially sexually exploited children. As part of my project, I have also identified a screening tool that Child Welfare workers and juvenile Probation Officers will use with youth to help determine whether the child may be a victim of CSE (see Appendix B). All adolescents in system care need routine screening for CSE because all adolescents in care are at risk of CSE (Kaplan and Kemp). This tool and the user training will be made available to all Child Welfare and juvenile Probation staff members.

The State of California provides funds specifically for counties that opt-in to the CSEC program. This program began a few years ago, yet Del Norte County has yet to opt-in to the CSEC Program or use any state funding for CSEC purposes. For Del Norte County to opt-in, they must submit a County Plan and an Interagency Protocol to the California Department of Social Services, also known as CDSS. One of the first steps in my project was to contact CDSS

regarding Del Norte County opting-in to the CSEC program. I was told Del Norte was welcome to submit the County Plan and Interagency Protocol, yet there was no guarantee of funding since the program began years ago. I then worked with leadership in Child Welfare Services to write up the County Plan and include all CSEC data from the information system. This plan was submitted to CDSS. I then began working on drafting the Interagency Protocol. This protocol outlines which county staff will be involved in the CSEC response team meetings, and how each agency can help. The protocol describes how the team will respond to identified cases of CSEC and calls for Multi-Disciplinary Team meetings of the members whenever a youth is identified as CSEC or suspected CSEC. These meetings will occur to best identify resources for each child/youth. This protocol was reviewed and approved by the County Counsel and signed by the management of each group included. I submitted the final Interagency Protocol to CDSS. Del Norte County is now officially part of the California CSEC Program and able to use funds for CSEC prevention. The County Plan and County Protocol are included in the Appendix for reference.

The second part of this project is to bring in state-recognized CSEC trainers to this rural county. In February and March of 2018, county staff and community members were trained on CSEC 102, which trains on engagement skills for working with commercially sexually exploited children and youth. This training provided information on what trafficking of children looks like, the experiences of these youth, and how professionals should interact with these youth. Present at this training were staff from Child Welfare Services, Resource Family Approval, Child Care Licensing, Del Norte County Unified School District, members of Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, North Coast Rape Crisis Team, an attorney who is running for Superior Court Judge and a resource

parent (foster parent). This training was held in a centrally located venue in the seat of Del Norte County in an effort to make the training location accessible to all community members.

In March of 2018, Child Welfare Social Workers and juvenile Probation Officers were trained on how to use a screening tool to screen for potential commercial sexual exploitation of youth. This training was conducted by a member of WestCoast Children's Clinic, the organization which developed the CSE-IT Screening Tool (Commercial Sexual Exploitation Identification Tool). To utilize this tool, an agency must pay for a trainer to train all the tool users and sign an MOU with WestCoast Children's Clinic. The MOU between Del Norte County and WestCoast Children's Clinic also needed approval from County Counsel prior to moving forward with implementation of this screening tool. Child Welfare Services and the Probation Department will use the CSE-IT Screening Tool with every minor over the age of ten encountered by these systems. The screening tool provides staff with a qualitative and numerical way to gauge whether the staff should further explore the possibility of the youth having been commercially sexually exploited. This screening tool is included in Appendix B. I anticipate that after the training and use of this tool, the number of suspected CSEC in the county will increase.

The third part of the project is to use asset mapping and gap analysis to identify local resources for commercially sexually exploited children. I developed a form and distributed it to a plethora of community agencies and county departments asking them to identify what resources their agency or department offers that would benefit CSEC. A copy of this form is attached in Appendix D. Del Norte County does not have many resources to assist a commercially sexually exploited child. This resource gap is an example of a need for further research and a potential project idea for implementation.

Discussion

Working toward establishing a local protocol for assisting Commercially Sexually Exploited Children has been fulfilling. Yet there are recognizable limitations on this project due to the time constraints of a Master's Thesis Project. In this section, I discuss these limitations, as well as hopes for what will continue throughout the implementation of this CSEC Protocol in Del Norte County.

Data Comparison. Data on human trafficking prevalence should play a larger role in public-policy (Raphael 16-17). The Child Welfare Services information system has a specific place to measure cases of CSEC and suspected CSEC. I measured the numbers in August of 2017 and I want to measure the same numbers again after the implementation of CSEC training and tools for county employees to see if the numbers change. I want to test whether my theory is correct, that training and tools will influence a higher number of identified CSEC or suspected CSEC cases. Time is the main barrier to measuring this data comparison. The time necessary to complete training, gain partner agreement, and obtain proper approval for all steps involved in this project does not allow for full implementation prior to the thesis project deadline for graduation requirements.

True measure of impact requires longitudinal measurement. While I can't do longitudinal measurement for my thesis, I recognize that true impact and true change can take years to see. According to what I have read, I will need to look at least two years after "baseline" to see how much of an impact this project really had (Lynch and Walls 136). I will also need to ensure I base my evaluation on the things valued most. What we count determines how we work, so it is vital to measure the right things (Bornstein & Davis 64).

Also, while the State of California will have its own measurement categories, it is important for Del Norte County to conduct their own program evaluation. Author Michael Hobbes explained the value of program evaluation within specific communities in his article "Stop Trying to Save the World" by detailing stories of how the same programs can succeed in some communities and fail in others. Each community has unique needs. A program cannot be tested only once and then declared to be beneficial across communities or throughout time. Continual evaluation is necessary.

Regardless of how long it takes, county staff and local community members need to be trained on human trafficking to help the county assist trafficked children. Personally, I need to follow up on this research theory. Professionally, I need to assess whether what we are doing is having the desired impact. If not, it will need to be altered to have the best possible impact on the community. Altering our behavior to reflect what we really value is revolutionary (Quinn 16).

Effective Collaboration. Collaboration of all parties involved takes time and communication. The “why” behind the CSEC Protocol needs to be clearly communicated in order for the team to move forward in unity (Sinek). Each member in the Del Norte County CSEC Protocol has specific resources to offer a commercially sexually exploited child. It is vital to get each member on board and engaged to fully utilize those resources and creatively design even more. For example, Public Health Nurses should be on board with the program since “Nurses have a vital role in combatting sex trafficking by raising awareness about the problem and restoring the lives of sex trafficking victims by implementing innovative care programs” (Twigg 259). School district employees and community clinicians also need to be involved in this work. While writing about how a history of caregiver domestic violence increases the risk of CSEC involvement, Kaplan and Kemp wrote that medical providers, school personnel, and

clinicians all play a role in observing warning signs and identifying youth at risk of CSEC (5). The Superior Court also can play an important role and was invited to help draft the county CSEC Protocol. Although the court is not required to attend any multi-disciplinary meetings regarding CSEC, it is important to note a study by Liles, et al. arguing that effectively helping CSEC warrants a specialized, multidisciplinary, and trauma-informed courtroom to best serve the comprehensive needs of CSEC youth (244). While adapting to the changing needs of the community, working with the “why” in mind will aid in meeting those needs, regardless of how the world changes with time.

Resource Development. It seems Deidra Ward was right in her assessment that there are not many local resources to assist children or youth whom may be identified as a victim of commercial sexual exploitation. This is a need for further research and a potential project idea for future implementation. Many of the agencies that participated in this research have programs and resources that may be developed further to serve CSEC specifically. Further research would benefit the local community.

Part of what the State of California encourages for county CSEC teams to include in protocol and response to trafficked minors is the Harm Reduction Strategy. The argument is that each professional should meet the youth where they are and help them get where they want to be. If the youth is not yet ready to leave their situation, the professional should help them access healthy resources to reduce harm.

Youth who have a safe, encouraging and youth friendly environment to learn about safety and resources “are able to define and develop protective factors against sex trafficking” (Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin 521). Youth removed from their exploiter and placed in care may run away within twenty-four hours and return to being exploited (Kaplan and Kemp 5).

These case studies support an argument for Harm Reduction Strategies which provide youth with knowledge and resources to make more safe decisions, as well as the safety to return to care providers after running back to their exploiter.

State-Wide Application. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children is likely happening in every county in California. If there is a member from another county in California interested in learning how to begin a CSEC program in their county, anyone is welcome to reach out to the County of Del Norte and ask to speak with the CSEC Coordinator. The California Department of Social Services will also be able to answer any questions from county social services agencies.

Conclusion

Rural communities cannot properly identify and help Commercially Sexually Exploited Children until they are aware the problem exists in their own communities, identify available resources, and establish an action plan. These communities should work toward this goal by training local staff on the reality of trafficking, establishing an interagency protocol for working with this population, and identifying community resources to help these children. While this project was conducted in rural California, the principles may be applied to any community in the United States. With local law enforcement, social services, the court, and community agencies working together as a team, CSEC within that community will be better served.

After years of working with young women and girls who have been brought out of sex trafficking, I feel compelled to combat human trafficking by prevention. There is a plethora of routes one can take when it comes to prevention, and I believe education is key. Educated people will be better informed when it comes to decision making. Educated youth have a better chance of overcoming poverty, and of making choices that will aid their personal and financial success. An educated community will know what signs to look for, whom they can contact if they suspect

trafficking, and ways to protect themselves and others from traffickers. Educated law enforcement will have a greater ability to prevent and detect trafficking and to make arrests that lead to convictions. Even educating the community on development and financial success can help alleviate some of the underlying causes that lead to the trafficking of people. Human trafficking is a global atrocity and requires education of communities both here in the United States and in communities abroad.

I have long desired to make a positive impact on the prevention of human trafficking. To work toward this goal in my own hometown is a great privilege. I am grateful to do this work both professionally and academically at this time in my life. I look forward to utilizing this information to benefit the children in the community.

Works Cited

Bornstein, D. and Susan Davis. *Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know*.

Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010.

Cain, Julie. Personal Interview. 14 June 2017.

Calderon, Monique. CSEC 102: Engagement Skills for Working with Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Transitional Age Youth, Nola Brantley Speaks, 28 February, 2018 and 1 March, 2018, Crescent Fire Protection District, Crescent City, CA. Training Presentation.

Central Intelligence Agency. [www.cia.gov%2Flibrary%2Fpublications%2Fresources%2Fthe-worldfactbook%2Fdocs%2Fnotesanddefs.html%3Ffieldkey%3D2129%26term%3DUnemployment%2520rate](http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-worldfactbook/docs/notesanddefs.html%3Ffieldkey%3D2129%26term%3DUnemployment%2520rate). Accessed 16 December 2016.

Child Welfare Council Commercially Sexually Exploited Children Action Team. Background and Purpose. All County Information Notice I-23-15, April 2015.

Countryman-Roswurm, Karen, and Brien L Bolin. "Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: Assessing and Reducing Risk." *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, vol. 31, no. 6, 2014, pp. 521–538.

Davis, Amber. Personal interview. 8 August 2017.

Diaz, Paola. *Introduction to Project Management: Project Management for Development*

Organizations. PM4DEV, 2007, www.pm4dev.com. Retrieved from:

http://eejp.org/resources/project_management/introduction_to_project_management.pdf.

Accessed 31 Aug. 2016.

- Dillehay, Victoria. "Sex trafficking here in Del Norte?" *The Daily Triplicate* [Crescent City, CA], 1, November 2016. <http://www.triplicate.com/news/localnews/4779254-151/sex-trafficking-here-in-del-norte>
- Farren, Cindy. Personal interview. 19 July 2017.
- Groody, Daniel. *Globalization, Spirituality, and Justice: Navigating the Path to Peace*. New York: Orbis Books, 2015.
- Harbert, Anita, and Jennifer Tucker-Tatlow. "Literature Review: Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children." *Southern Area Consortium of Human Services*, February 2014.
- Hartinger-Saunders RM, et al. "Mandated Reporters' Perceptions of and Encounters with Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking of Adolescent Females in the United States." *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 87, no. 3, 2017, pp. 195–205.
- Hobbes, Michael. "Stop Trying to Save the World." *New Republic*, 17 Nov. 2014. Web. <https://newrepublic.com/article/120178/problem-international-development-and-plan-fix-it>
- Kaplan, Dana, and Kathleen Kemp. "Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: An Emerging Health Crisis." *The Brown University Child and Adolescent Behavior Letter*, vol. 31, no. 7, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli, eds. *The Globalization Reader*. 5th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- Liles, Brandi D., et al. "A California Multidisciplinary Juvenile Court: Serving Sexually Exploited and At-Risk Youth." *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, vol. 34, no. 1, Jan/Feb2016, pp. 234-245.

- Lynch, Kevin, and Julius Walls, Jr. *Mission, Inc.: The Practitioners Guide to Social Enterprise* (Social Venture Network Series). Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Kindle Edition.
- McNeal, Brittani A, and Jeffery T Walker. "Parental Effects on the Exchange of Sex for Drugs or Money in Adolescents." *American Journal of Criminal Justice: The Journal of the Southern Criminal Justice Association*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2016, pp. 710–731.
- Merriam, Sharan B. and Elizabeth J. Tisdell, *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.
- Nielsen, Crystal. Personal interview. 9 February 2018.
- Quinn, Robert E. "An Invitation to Transformation." *Change the World: How Ordinary People Can Achieve Extraordinary Results*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2000.
- Raphael, Jody. "Returning Trafficking Prevalence to the Public Policy Debate: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Journal of Human Trafficking*, 3:1, 1-20. 2017.
- Rafferty, Yvonne. "Child Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation: A Review of Promising Prevention Policies and Programs." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 83, no. 4, 2013, pp. 559–575.
- Senate Bill No. 855. California Legislative Information.
leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB855
 Accessed 20 April 2018.
- Senate Bill No. 1322. California Legislative Information.
leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB1322
 Accessed 20 April 2018.
- Sinek, Simon. *Start With Why: How Great Leaders Inspire Everyone to Action*. New York: Penguin Publishers, 2009. Audiobook.

Sunstein, Bonnie Stone, and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater. *Fieldworking: Reading and Writing Research*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011.

Torres, Jessica. CSEC 102: Engagement Skills for Working with Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Transitional Age Youth, Nola Brantley Speaks, 28 February, 2018 and 1 March, 2018, Crescent Fire Protection District, Crescent City, CA. Training Presentation.

Twigg, NM. "Comprehensive Care Model for Sex Trafficking Survivors." *Journal of Nursing Scholarship: An Official Publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing*, vol. 49, no. 3, 2017, pp. 259–266.

United States Department of State. *Trafficking in Persons Report*.

www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2013/210543.htm. Accessed 19 August 2017.

United States Census Bureau. Population Division.

factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk.

Accessed 16 December 2016.

Walsh, Shannon Drysdale. "Sex Trafficking and the State: Applying Domestic Abuse Interventions to Serve Victims of Sex Trafficking." *Human Rights Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2016, pp. 221–245.

Ward, Deidra. Personal interview. 20 July 2017.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE COUNTY OF DEL NORTE

COMMERCIALY SEXUALLY EXPLOITED CHILDREN PROGRAM

**Memorandum of Understanding for the
County of Del Norte Commercially
Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)
Program**

Effective January 2018

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AMONG

Del Norte Department of Health and Human Services, Child Welfare Agency, Mental Health Branch, Public Health Branch, Del Norte County Probation Department, Del Norte County Alcohol and Other Drug Programs, Del Norte County Sheriff's Department, Del Norte County Unified School District.

As to County of Del Norte's Obligation to Identify, Document, and Determine Appropriate Services for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Those At Risk for Exploitation

WHEREAS, County of Del Norte child welfare agency and probation department shall implement policies and procedures, pursuant to Section 16501.35 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code, that require social workers and probation officers to identify, document and determine appropriate services for children who are, or are at risk of becoming, victims of commercial sexual exploitation; and receive relevant training in order to be able to do so; and

WHEREAS, County of Del Norte child welfare agency and probation department shall develop and implement specific protocols to expeditiously locate any child missing from foster care, pursuant to Section 16501.45 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code; and

WHEREAS, County of Del Norte social workers and probation officers shall, pursuant to Section 16501.45 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code, collect the following data on children who were victims of commercial sexual exploitation before entering care, after entering care, while absent from care, and children who are at risk of becoming exploited.

As to the County of Del Norte's Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) Program

WHEREAS, an individual who is sexually trafficked, as described in Section 236.1 of the California Penal Code, or who receives food or shelter in exchange for, or who is paid to perform, sexual acts described in Section 236.1 or 11165.1 of the California Penal Code, and whose parent or guardian failed to, or was unable to protect the child, is a commercially sexually exploited child and may be served through the County of Del Norte child welfare system pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 300(b)(2); and

WHEREAS, County of Del Norte elected to participate in the CSEC Program as described in Section 16524.7 of California Welfare and Institutions Code in order to more effectively serve CSEC by utilizing a multidisciplinary approach for case management, service planning, and the provision of services; and

WHEREAS, the MOU reflects the County of Del Norte and the parties' commitment to the following guiding principles:

A. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children:

1. Must be understood as child abuse and reported as such, and
2. Should not be criminalized.

B. Responses to CSEC should be:

1. Victim-centered,
2. Trauma-informed,
3. Strengths-based,
4. Developmentally appropriate,
5. Culturally, linguistically, and LGBTQ competent and affirming,
6. Committed to active efforts that engage CSEC early and often,
7. Multidisciplinary, individualized, flexible, and timely, and
8. Data and outcome driven.

C. Agency Policies & Procedures should:

1. Ensure and track cross-system collaboration at the system and individual case level,
2. Incorporate mechanisms to identify and assess CSEC at key decision points,
3. Address the unique physical and emotional safety considerations of CSEC, and
4. Address unique physical and emotional safety considerations, including vicarious trauma of staff, caregivers, and other relevant support persons.

WHEREAS, the parties agree to form a multidisciplinary team (MDT), pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 16524.7(d)(2) for CSEC, to build on a youth's strengths and respond to his/her needs in a coordinated manner; and

WHEREAS, the parties, as defined by law, must comply with mandatory reporting guidelines as defined by California Penal Code Sections 11164 – 11174.3 and report known or suspected child abuse and neglect, which includes sexual exploitation; and

WHEREAS, the County agency that receives the initial report shall, pursuant to Penal code Sections 11166(j)(1) immediately, or as soon as practicably possible, cross report known or suspected child abuse or neglect to the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the case, to the agency given the responsibility for investigation of cases under Section 300 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, and the district attorney's office; and

WHEREAS, the County of Del Norte probation or welfare departments shall, pursuant to Penal code Sections 11166(j)(1) immediately report to law enforcement for entry into the National Crime Information Center and to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children when children receiving child welfare services that are, or are at risk of being commercially sexually exploited, go missing or are abducted.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties of this MOU set forth the following as the terms and conditions of their understanding:

I. Identification

A. The parties agree that youth will be screened as follows:

1. The following parties are required to screen youth to identify whether they have been commercially sexually exploited, are being commercially sexually exploited, or are at risk of becoming commercially sexually exploited:
 - i. Child Welfare Agency
 - (i) Child abuse hotline staff
 - (ii) Emergency response investigators
 - (iii) Case carrying social workers
 - ii. Probation Department
 - (i) Juvenile Hall staff
 - (ii) Deputy Probation Officers
 - (iii) School-based Juvenile Probation Officers

B. The following parties are also responsible to identify commercially sexually exploited children or children at risk of becoming commercially sexually exploited.

1. Public Health Branch-Physical Health
 - i. Emergency Room medical professionals including physicians and nurses
 - ii. Teen clinic medical professionals
2. Office of Education
 - i. Foster Youth Services coordinator
 - ii. School-based counselors.

C. County intake workers or child welfare services workers who receive a referral indicating the commercial sexual exploitation of any child, must track this referral regardless of disposition.

1. County social workers and probation officers must document children receiving child welfare services who have been identified as victims or at-risk of CSE, and collect the following data to be made available to the CDSS.
 - i. Children receiving child welfare services who:
 1. Are at risk of becoming victims of CSE
 2. Were victims of CSE before entering foster care
 3. Became victims of CSE during foster care
 4. Go missing, run away, or are otherwise absent from care and were commercially sexually exploited during the time away from placement
 5. Were victims of CSE while in an open case, but not in foster care
 6. Were victims of CSE while in a closed case, but while receiving ILP services.

D. Documentation

1. When the Child Welfare Agency and Probation Department identify CSEC and those at risk of becoming CSEC, the department will document the information contained in subdivision C in the Child Welfare Services Case Management System.

E. Screening Tool

1. The Commercial Sexual Exploitation- Identification Tool (CSE-IT) will be used as a screening instrument as described in this MOU.
2. All parties will receive and review a copy of the CSE-IT, including an overview of the tool, and understand the training required for use (attached to this MOU).

F. MDT

1. When a victim or potential victim of CSE is identified, the members of the MDT meeting will convene to work toward identifying further assessment and/or identifying best options for the child/youth.

II. Reporting Requirements

A. Mandatory reporting requirements for CSEC and those at risk for such exploitation

1. The parties must report known or suspected abuse and neglect, pursuant to Cal. Penal Code § 11166.
2. Any person providing services to a minor is a mandated reporter of suspected child abuse or neglect.
 - i. Any employee of a county office of education whose duties bring the employee into contact with children on a regular basis
 - ii. A public assistance worker
 - iii. An employee of a child care institution
 - iv. A public health employee who treats a minor
 - v. Any employee of any police department, county sheriff's department, county probation department, or county welfare department
 - vi. Medical personnel and counselors
 - vii. An employee or volunteer of a CASA
3. All participating agencies must comply with mandatory reporting laws as set forth in the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act.
 - i. Mandated reporters are required to report abuse or neglect when they know or have reasonable suspicion that the abuse or neglect has occurred.
 - ii. Sexual exploitation is a form of sexual abuse and must be reported by mandated reporters.

B. Cross report suspected abuse and neglect

1. Child Welfare and Probation must immediately, or as soon as practicably possible, report by telephone, fax or electronic submission known or suspected instances of child abuse or neglect to:
 - i. The law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the case,
 - ii. The agency responsible for investigating reports of abuse or neglect under Cal. Welf. & Inst. § Code 300, AND
 - iii. The district attorney's office.
2. If submitting a referral by telephone, the written reports must then be sent within 36 hours of receiving the information concerning the incident.

C. Report to law enforcement when child is identified as victim of CSE

1. Child Welfare or Probation shall immediately, and no more than 24 hours upon receiving information, report to the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the case that a child who is receiving child welfare services has been identified as the victim of CSE, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 11165.1.

D. Report a known or suspected victim of CSE who is missing or has been abducted

1. Child Welfare or Probation shall immediately, and in no case later than 24 hours from receiving information, report to law enforcement that a child:
 - i. Who is receiving child welfare services, AND

- ii. Who is reasonably believed to be the victim of, or is at risk of being the victim of, CSE, AND
 - iii. Is missing or has been abducted.
- 2. Child Welfare or Probation shall immediately, and no later than 24 hours from receiving information, report to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children via telephone (1-800-THE-LOST) or through the web portal a child:
 - i. Who is receiving child welfare services, AND
 - ii. Who is reasonably believed to be the victim of, or is at risk of being the victim of, CSE, AND
 - iii. Is missing or has been abducted.
- 3. Law enforcement must enter information it receives into the National Crime Information Center database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

III. Assessment

A. Description of the assessment process

- 1. The above parties agree that an assessment of an exploited youth's needs and strengths must take place upon identification and on an ongoing basis. Further, the parties agree that it is in the youth's best interest to limit unnecessary and/or duplicative assessments. Accordingly, the parties will coordinate to ensure that assessments are streamlined and limited when appropriate.
 - i. The parties must assess an identified victim or a child at risk of commercial sexual exploitation under the following circumstances:
 - (i) Child Welfare Agency:
 - 1. When an allegation of abuse or neglect is investigated,
 - 2. Upon a change in placement, and/or
 - 3. Every six months to monitor progress.
 - (ii) Probation Department:
 - 1. When a child enters the juvenile detention facility,
 - 2. When a child is interviewed to determine viable candidacy for probation supervision,
 - 3. Upon a change in placement, and/or
 - 4. Every six months to monitor progress.
 - (iii) Mental Health Branch:
 - 1. When a child is referred to mental health clinician for services.

IV. Documentation

A. Documenting commercially sexually exploited and at-risk children

- 1. Upon identifying that a child receiving child welfare services is at risk or a victim of CSE, the parties must document this information in the Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS).
- 2. The following parties are responsible for entering into CWS/CMS the data outlined in the next subsection
 - i. Child Welfare Agency
 - (i) Social Worker
 - (ii) Child abuse hotline worker
 - ii. Probation Department

- (i) Probation Officer
- 3. Child Welfare and Probation are responsible for collecting and entering the following data point in CWS/CMS regarding any child:
 - i. Referral alleging CSE of a child or youth:
 - (i) The Child Welfare intake worker or child protective services worker is responsible for taking referrals alleging CSE, and must use the “S-CSEC Referral” Special Project Code in CWS/CMS to document each unique referral on a youth
 - ii. Children receiving child welfare services who are identified as at-risk or victims of CSE:
 - (i) Child Welfare and Probation are responsible for collecting and entering the following six data points in CWS/CMS regarding children receiving child welfare services who are identified as at-risk or victims of CSE:
 1. At Risk – children receiving child welfare services who are at risk of becoming victims of CSE, as defined in ACL No. 16-49.
 2. Victims Before Foster Care – Dependent children or wards in foster care who were victims of CSE before entering foster care.
 3. Victim During Foster Care – Dependent children or wards in foster care who became victims of CSE while in foster care.
 4. Victim While Absent from Placement- Dependent children or wards in foster care who go missing, run away, or are otherwise absent from care and were commercially sexually exploited during the time away from placement.
 5. Victim in Open Case Not in Foster Care – Children receiving child welfare services, but are not in foster care, who become victims of CSE.
 6. Victim in Closed Case Receiving ILP Services.

V. Multidisciplinary Response

A. Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) meetings

1. The parties agree to provide staff to participate in MDT meetings who have been trained in the prevention, identification or treatment of child abuse and neglect cases and who are qualified to provide a broad range of services related to child abuse and commercially sexually exploited children and those at risk for such exploitation in order to sufficiently address a commercially sexually exploited child’s needs from identification through ongoing identification.

B. The following parties agree to participate in the MDTs:

1. Child Welfare – Lead
2. Probation
3. Mental Health
4. Alcohol and Other Drugs
5. Public Health
6. Sheriff’s Office
7. Del Norte County Unified School District

VI. Training

A. CSEC protocol training

1. In order to ensure effective implementation of the provisions outlined above, the County of Del Norte agrees to develop and implement training for all parties. This training will be specific to the roles and responsibilities delineated in this MOU. It will cover the identification, documentation, and determination of appropriate services for children receiving child welfare services.
2. The following parties must participate in the CSEC protocol trainings:
 - i. Child Welfare
 - (i) Emergency Response workers
 - (ii) Case carrying social workers
 - (iii) Child abuse hotline screeners
 - (iv) Supervisors
 - ii. Probation
 - (i) Juvenile hall and probation services intake staff
 - (ii) Probations Officers, including placement probation officers and supervisors
 - iii. Other parties of the MOU may designate specific staff members to participate in the training as they see necessary.

VII. Information Sharing and Confidentiality

A. Information Sharing

1. The CSEC collaborating agencies agree to the sharing of information, to appropriate use by parties that complies with state and federal laws, ethical considerations governing confidentiality including re-disclosure and privilege, and that does not violate the youth's due process rights as respondents or defendants in delinquency, criminal, and child welfare cases, including the rights against self-incrimination.

B. Confidentiality

1. MDT team members will act in accordance with the Health Information Privacy Act and with Welfare and Institutions Code guidelines for confidentiality and information sharing address in codes 830, 830.1, 10850.1, and 18951 during all phases of the MDT process.
2. Information and records communicated or provided to the team members by all providers and agencies, as well as information and records created in the course of a child abuse or neglect investigation, shall be deemed private and confidential and shall be protected from discovery and disclosure by all applicable statutory and common law protections. Existing civil and criminal penalties shall apply to the inappropriate disclosure of information held by the team members. Said information may be confidential under the laws of California, including but not limited to Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 827, 10850; Division 19 California Department of Social Services Manual of Policies and Procedures, Confidentiality of Information; and/or the laws of the United States. The MDT shall comply with all laws regarding confidentiality. Each member of the MDT shall sign a copy of the MDT Confidentiality Agreement and return to Child Welfare Services.

The undersigned state that this Memorandum of Understanding has been reviewed and indicate approval of the MOU as to form and legality.

DEL NORTE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

/s/ _____

Director Date

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

/s/ _____

Program Manager Date

PUBLIC HEALTH BRANCH

/s/ _____

Program Manager Date

MENTAL HEALTH BRANCH

/s/ _____

Program Manager Date

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG PROGRAMS

/s/ _____

Program Manager Date

DEL NORTE COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

/s/ _____

Chief Date

DEL NORTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

/s/ _____

Sheriff Date

DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

/s/ _____

APPENDIX B

COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION IDENTIFICATION TOOL

WestCoast Children's Clinic
Commercial Sexual Exploitation Identification Tool (CSE-IT) version 2.0

1. HOUSING AND CAREGIVING. The youth experiences housing or caregiving instability for any reason.	No Information	No Concer	Possible Concer	Clear Concer
a. Youth runs away or frequently leaves their residence for extended periods of time (overnight, days, weeks).	0	0	1	2
b. Youth experiences unstable housing, including multiple foster/group home placements.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth experiences periods of homelessness, e.g. living on the street or couch surfing.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth relies on emergency or temporary resources to meet basic needs, e.g. hygiene, shelter, food, medical care.	0	0	1	2
e. Parent/caregiver is unable to provide adequate supervision.	0	0	1	2
f. Youth has highly irregular school attendance, including frequent or prolonged tardiness or absences.	0	0	1	2
g. Youth has current or past involvement with the child welfare	0	0	1	2
Indicator 1 Score: A subtotal of 4-5 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal \square 6 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> .	0	0	1	2
2. PRIOR ABUSE OR TRAUMA. The youth has experienced trauma (not including exploitation).	No Information	No Concer	Possible Concer	Clear Concer
a. Youth has been sexually abused.	0	0	1	2
b. Youth has been physically abused.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth has been emotionally abused.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth has witnessed domestic violence.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 2 Score: A subtotal of 2 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal \mid 3 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> .	0	0	1	2
3. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND APPEARANCE. The youth experiences notable changes in health and appearance.	No Information	No Concer	Possible Concer	Clear Concer
a. Youth presents a significant change in appearance, e.g. dress,	0	0	1	2
b. Youth shows signs of physical trauma, such as bruises, black eyes, cigarette burns, or broken bones.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth has tattoos, scarring or branding, indicating being treated as someone's property.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth has repeated or concerning testing or treatment for pregnancy	0	0	1	2
e. Youth is sleep deprived or sleep is inconsistent.	0	0	1	2
f. Youth has health problems or complaints related to poor nutrition or irregular access to meals.	0	0	1	2
g. Youth's substance use impacts their health or interferes with their ability to function.	0	0	1	2
h. Youth experiences significant change or escalation in their	0	0	1	2
Indicator 3 Score: A subtotal of 2-3 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal \sqcup 4 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> .	0	0	1	2
4. ENVIRONMENT AND EXPOSURE. The youth's environment or activities place them at risk of exploitation.	No Information	No Concer	Possible Concer	Clear Concer
a. Youth engages in sexual activities that cause harm or place them at risk of victimization.	0	0	1	2

b. Youth spends time where exploitation is known to occur.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth uses language that suggests involvement in exploitation.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth is connected to people who are exploited, or who buy or	0	0	1	2

Copyright WestCoast Children's Clinic 2016. The WestCoast Children's Clinic CSE-IT is an open domain tool for use in service delivery systems that serve children and youth. The copyright is held by WestCoast Children's Clinic to ensure that it remains free to use. For permission to use or for information, please contact screening@westcoastcc.org. v2.0 08112016

e. Youth is bullied or targeted about exploitation.	0	0	1	2
f. Youth has current or past involvement with law enforcement or juvenile justice.	0	0	1	2
g. Gang affiliation or contact involves youth in unsafe sexual encounters.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 4 Score: A subtotal of 1 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal <input type="checkbox"/> 2 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> . Circlescore here <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0	0	1	2
5. RELATIONSHIPS AND PERSONAL BELONGINGS. The youth's relationships and belongings are not consistent with their age or circumstances, suggesting possible recruitment by an exploiter.	No Information	No Concern	Possible Concern	Clear Concern
a. Youth has unhealthy, inappropriate or romantic relationships, including (but not limited to) with someone older/an adult.	0	0	1	2
b. Youth meets with contacts they developed over the internet, including sex partners or boyfriends/girlfriends.	0	0	1	2
c. Explicit photos of the youth are posted on the internet or on their phone.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth receives or has access to unexplained money, credit cards, hotel keys, gifts, drugs, alcohol, transportation.	0	0	1	2
e. Youth has several cell phones or their cell phone number changes frequently.	0	0	1	2
f. Youth travels to places that are inconsistent with their life circumstances.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 5 Score: A subtotal of 1-2 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal <input type="checkbox"/> 3 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> . Circlescore here <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0	0	1	2
6. SIGNS OF CURRENT TRAUMA. The youth exhibits signs of trauma exposure.	No Information	No Concern	Possible Concern	Clear Concern
a. Youth appears on edge, preoccupied with safety, or hypervigilant.	0	0	1	2
b. Youth has difficulty detecting or responding to danger cues.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth engages in self-destructive, aggressive, or risk-taking behaviors.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth has a high level of distress about being accessible by cell phone.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 6 Score: A subtotal of 1-2 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal <input type="checkbox"/> 3 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> . Circlescore here <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0	0	1	2
7. COERCION. The youth is being controlled or coerced by another person.	No Information	No Concern	Possible Concern	Clear Concern
a. Youth has an abusive or controlling intimate partner.	0	0	1	2
b. Someone else is controlling the youth's contact with family or friends, leaving the youth socially isolated.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth is coerced into getting pregnant, having an abortion, or using contraception.	0	0	1	2
d. Someone is not allowing the youth to sleep regularly or in a safe place, go to school, eat, or meet other basic needs.	0	0	1	2
e. The youth or their friends, family, or other acquaintances receive threats.	0	0	1	2
f. Youth gives vague or misleading information about their age, whereabouts, residence, or relationships.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 7 Score: A subtotal of 1 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal <input type="checkbox"/> 2 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> . Circlescore here <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0	0	1	2
8. EXPLOITATION. The youth exchanges sex for money or material goods, including food or shelter.	No Information	No Concern	Possible Concern	Clear Concern
a. Youth is exchanging sex for money or material goods, including food or shelter for themselves or someone else, e.g. child, family, partner.	0	0	1	2
b. Youth is watched, filmed or photographed in a sexually explicit manner.	0	0	1	2
c. Youth has a history of sexual exploitation.	0	0	1	2
d. Youth is forced to give the money they earn to another person.	0	0	1	2
Indicator 8 Score: A subtotal of 1 indicates <i>Possible Concern</i> . A subtotal <input type="checkbox"/> 2 indicates <i>Clear Concern</i> . Circlescore here <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	0	0	1	2

Scoring Instructions:

1. Enter each Indicator Score in the corresponding box in this table.
2. Add Indicator Scores 1-7 and enter the total in box A.
3. If Indicator 8 score = 1 (Possible Concern), enter 4 in box B. If Indicator 8 score = 2 (Clear Concern), enter 9 in box B.
4. Add boxes A and B for a Total Score between 0 and 23, and enter the Total Score in the final box.
5. Plot the Total Score on the Continuum of Concern below to determine level of concern for exploitation.

Indicator:		Indicator score
1. HOUSING AND CAREGIVING		
2. PRIOR ABUSE OR TRAUMA		
3. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND APPEARANCE		
4. ENVIRONMENT AND EXPOSURE		
5. RELATIONSHIPS AND PERSONAL BELONGINGS		
6. SIGNS OF CURRENT TRAUMA		
7. COERCION		
Add scores for indicators 1-7 (Score cannot exceed 14):	A.	
8. EXPLOITATION		
If Indicator 8 score is 1 (Possible Concern) put 4 in Box B If Indicator 8 is a 2 (Clear Concern) put 9 in Box B	B.	
TOTAL: Add boxes A and B for a total score between 0-23.	TOTAL	

Continuum of Concern

(draw a line indicating level of concern
for exploitation)



APPENDIX C

COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN 102 TRAINING FLYER

CSEC 102: Engagement Skills for Working with Commercially Sexually Exploited Children and Transitional Age Youth

CSEC 102 will focus on:

- **Engagement skills**
- **Overview of trauma**
- **Overview of the Stages of Change model**
- **AWOLing and peer recruitment**

Join your colleagues in learning how to better engage commercially sexually exploited youth in an inspiring 2-day training

**February 28th 8:00am - 5:00pm
& March 1st 8:00am-12:00pm**

Nola Brantley Speaks offers this 2-day Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) 102 engagement skills training. If you are working directly with youth, it will equip you with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to better engage youth at-risk of becoming involved in CSEC, and help you learn strategies for helping CSEC survivors see themselves as more than a survivor. If you are not working directly with youth, this training will help you identify the qualities to look for in agencies as you make referrals for youth.

The 2-day training is presented by survivors of commercial sexual exploitation who are national experts on the topic. You will hear real life examples of challenges and triumphs in working with the CSEC population.

CSEC 101 is a required prerequisite

If you have not taken CSEC 101 you can go online to the [CalsWEC](https://calswec.org) website to take this training online at <https://calswec.instructure.com/courses/169>

Location:

**CRESCENT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM
255 W WASHINGTON BLVD
CRESCENT CITY, CA 95531**

To register for this event, or if you have any questions, please contact

Kimberly Williams
464-3191 ext. 2701
kwilliams@co.del-norte.ca.us



APPENDIX D

ASSET MAPPING/GAP ANALYSIS FORM

Resources in Del Norte County for Victims of Human Trafficking/Commercial Sexual Exploitation

California counties have varying levels of resources to meet the needs of those who have been commercially sexually exploited. Building awareness of these needs, the current services available to victims of commercial sexual exploitation, and the providers working with this population is an important step forward for supporting interagency coordination. Counties may choose to conduct a gap analysis or asset mapping, and share the results with relevant county parties and providers. The Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) team would like to use these results as they will inform its understanding of CSEC-response strengths and gaps. The placements and service providers identified can also be the start to a statewide resource list that can be utilized by public agencies and community-based partners.

To conduct an analysis of local CSEC resources, the following data points will be critical to capture for each service and/or placement provider with relevance to CSEC:

- **Organization name**

- **Name, email, and phone number of intake/referral staff**

- **Location**

- **Counties/areas served**

- **Type of provider (placement or service provider)**

- **Programs offered by the provider (e.g., individual counseling, mentorship programs, vocational programs)**

- **Clients served (e.g., probation, child welfare, or non-system involved; age range, gender)**

- **Additional security measures (e.g., 24-hour staff)**

- **Training staff has received on CSEC**

- **Funding limitations for serving youth (e.g., must be under jurisdiction of dependency/delinquency)**

- **Organizational strengths for serving commercially sexually exploited children**

- **Organizational barriers for serving commercially sexually exploited children**

- **Please provide any additional information you would like to include:**

Thank you for assisting with asset mapping of Del Norte County resources for children who have been commercially sexually exploited. If you have any questions or would like to be involved in any way in the process of establishing a county protocol to work with these children, please contact me at kwilliams@co.del-norte.ca.us or (707) 464-3191 ext. 2701.

If your agency is able to complete this form, you may scan and email directly to my email address above or mail it to the address below:

Kimberly Williams
Department of Health and Human Services
880 Northcrest Drive
Crescent City, CA 95531

APPENDIX E
CSEC PLAN
COUNTY OF DEL NORTE

1. Basic County Contact Information

County: Del Norte

Please provide contact information for the person who is best positioned to receive emails and disseminate critical information regarding the CSEC Program to the CSEC staff in your county.

Contact Name	Kimberly Williams
Title	Staff Services Analyst
Email	kwilliams@co.del-norte.ca.us
Phone Number	(707) 464-3191 ext. 2701

County CSEC Coordinator name (if different from contact above)	
Title	
Email	
Phone Number	

2. Prevalence Data*

Counties are required to properly document within the CWS/CMS children and youth who are alleged or suspected to be victims or at risk of CSE (see [ACL No. 16-74](#) and [16-49](#)). Please provide data for the following CSEC categories from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and use the following data hierarchy if multiple codes were entered on one case or referral:

1. Victim During Care
2. Victim in Open Case, Not in Foster Care (FC)
3. Victim while Absent Without Leave (AWOL)
4. Victim in Closed Case, Receiving (Rcv) Independent Living Program (ILP) Services (Svcs)
5. Victim Before Care
6. At Risk

CSEC Victim During Care	CSEC Victim Before Care	CSEC Victim in Open Case not in FC	CSEC While AWOL	At Risk** of CSEC	Other- Please Specify
0	0	0	0	0	0

Additionally, please provide the overall number of youth who were referred to the child abuse hotline with an allegation of CSE and therefore entered in the CWS/CMS with special project code “S-CSEC Referral” between July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017. For clarification on the “S-CSEC Referral” special project code please review [ACL No. 16-74](#).

Number of “S-CSEC Referral”	0
-----------------------------	---

*Prevalence data for children or youth receiving child welfare services through the County Child Welfare Department. The CDSS understands that County Child Welfare Departments may not have a mechanism to extract CSEC prevalence data from probation. However, Child Welfare Departments are encouraged to consult and work collaboratively with Probation Departments to complete the updated County Plans, including providing Probation prevalence data that illustrates the full picture of CSEC prevalence within counties.

** The “At Risk” definition can be found in [ACL No. 16-85](#).

Please provide the number of victims and at risk children/youth **served to date** (i.e. referrals and open cases as identified through the above CSEC data types) from the start of the CSEC Program (FY 2014-15) to now.

Number of CSEC victims served.	0
--------------------------------	---

Number of children/youth at risk of commercial sexual exploitation served.	0
---	---

Describe the capacity in which identified CSEC are served. What types of services, education or outreach are currently in place and being provided?

Serving CSEC
<p>Del Norte County has not had any identified cases of CSE; however, the county is in the beginning stages of developing an interagency protocol for working with CSEC. While developing the protocol, the community will receive education on CSE, how to identify CSE, what services are available, and how to prevent CSE.</p> <p>The local Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation is also in the process of developing policy and procedure to specifically assist tribal CSEC.</p> <p>While our numbers of identified CSEC cases are currently low, the county plans to initiate county-wide training in an effort to focus in on identifying CSEC and children/youth at risk of CSEC.</p>

Describe the capacity in which at risk children/youth are served. What types of services, education or outreach are currently in place and being provided?

Serving At Risk Children/Youth
At risk children and youth have access to Child Welfare Services, Mental Health services and counseling through Remi Vista. At risk children and families also have access to Wraparound services provided through Child Welfare Services.

Please describe your county process for using the CSEC Data Grid, including:

- When in the referral process does the social worker input information into the CSEC Data Grid?
- Are abuse subcategories selected when the social worker receives the referral or at the conclusion of the investigation?

Narrative of CSEC Data Grid Process for Social Workers
At the conclusion of the investigation.

Please describe how your county's probation officers are entering the same CSEC data for probation youth who are receiving child welfare services.

Narrative of CSEC Data Entry Process for Probation Officers
Upon the identification, verification, or reasonable suspicion a youth falls within the outlined CSEC definition; it will be reflected for data collection in CWS/CMS at the same time the youth's monthly contact information is documented.

In order for CDSS to address the system limitations of CWS/CMS and provide appropriate technical assistance, please identify specific challenges relating to CSEC documentation in CWS/CMS for Social Workers.

CWS/CMS Reporting Challenges for Social Workers
The County of Del Norte is a rural community in which CSE is not often seen and is not easily identified. When CSE is suspected, it has been difficult to substantiate. Each staff member will need to receive proper training and reminders to document CSE correctly.

In order for CDSS to address the system limitations of CWS/CMS entry for probation, please identify specific challenges relating to CSEC documentation for probation officers.

CWS/CMS Reporting Challenges for Probation Officers
Given the small county population and rural location, Probation sees the same difficulties in identifying CSE youth as CWS. Probation will need staff to receive updated training and on-going refreshers to ensure correct data entry.

3. CSEC Protocol Implementation

Please provide the status of your current county protocol implementation, including successes and challenges regarding protocol implementation.

Narrative of County Protocol Implementation
<p>The County of Del Norte is in the beginning stages of developing an interagency protocol for working with CSEC. A main challenge is getting all of the required parties to participate. Child Welfare Services and Juvenile Probation have committed to making this protocol work. Many community agencies have also expressed a desire to be a part of the interagency protocol. We will be able to work with a domestic violence shelter, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, Soroptimist International, and Rape Crisis. The next step involves speaking with Mental Health, Public Health, AOD and Juvenile Court in an effort to gain their investment in the protocol.</p> <p>County agencies have identified main barriers specific to Del Norte County as a lack of training, a lack of resources, and understaffed county agencies. In conjunction with implementing a county protocol, the county will provide training to all county agencies on CSE, how to identify CSEC, and how to work together to provide identified and at risk CSEC the proper resources. As a small, rural community, there is a lack of resources specific to CSEC. As stated above, a barrier to the county protocol implementation has been a significant amount of staff turnover, as well as understaffed county agencies.</p>

On September 26, 2016, California enacted [SB 1322](#), which amended [Penal Code sections 647\(b\)](#) and [653.22, effective January 1, 2017](#), to make crimes of soliciting or engaging in any act of prostitution and loitering with the intent to commit prostitution inapplicable to a child under 18 years of age who engages in such conduct to receive money or other consideration and instead specifies these children may be adjudged dependent children of the court. As mandated reporters, law enforcement partners must refer all CSEC victims and youth suspected to be at risk of CSE to the corresponding Child Welfare agency. Please provide a narrative regarding your county's Child Welfare and law enforcement collaborative efforts to address SB 1322 requirements including any efforts to amend Interagency Protocols, future plans, and estimated time of completion.

Collaborative Efforts to Address SB 1322
--

<p>No youth have been referred to Child Welfare from law enforcement thus far. Local law enforcement agencies also have a significant amount of staff turnover. The CSEC team plans to work with the local Police Department and Sheriff's Office to establish training and policy on how to identify CSEC and when to refer youth to Child Welfare. The plan is to complete these steps in FY 2017/2018.</p>

County Interagency Protocols should be updated to include the provisions of WIC sections [16501.1\(g\)\(19\)](#), [16501.35](#), [16524.8](#) and Penal Code (PC) sections [647](#) and [653.22](#).

Submit a copy of the updated Interagency Protocol along with your County Plan to CSECProgram@dss.ca.gov by **September 1, 2017**.

If the Interagency Protocol has not yet been updated, please describe your plan for updating the protocol and indicate anticipated amendments below. Counties must submit an updated version as soon as possible, in accordance with the plan.

Amendments that reflect new compliance measures with SB 1322 should be inserted in the next text box.

Interagency Protocol Amendments

<p>The County of Del Norte is in the beginning stages of developing an interagency protocol and plans to utilize the template provided, as well as personalizing the template as needed.</p>
--

4. The Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) Process

Are the following listed agencies regular and active participants in your MDTs? (yes/no)

Child Welfare	Yes
Probation	Yes
Public Health	No
Mental Health	Yes
Substance Abuse Disorder	No

<p>What types of MDT meetings have been held thus far? (i.e. initial, ongoing, immediate/ER, other, please specify)</p>	<p>Ongoing Interagency Case Management Team MDTs are held for special cases of at risk youth. Due to our low numbers of identified CSEC, these MDTs are conducted at the same time. If there is a CSEC case, required county agencies will be asked to attend that MDT and any concurrent meetings.</p>
<p>Who were the participants (aside from the agencies noted above)?</p>	<p>School District, Foster Youth Services, Remi Vista, tribal social services, Regional Center</p>

What cross system partners have yet to participate in MDTs that would enhance future discussions? (i.e. education, law enforcement, etc.)	Public Health, AOD, Juvenile Court
Do the youth and/or family participate in MDT meetings? Why or why not?	The MDT's are agency-only meetings. Individual meetings are set up with families and any specific agencies who may assist with their individual situation.
How do you ensure cross county / cross state collaboration in your MDT process when your county identifies an out-of-county / out-of-state child or when another county / state identifies a child from your county?	Del Norte County will collaborate and follow the same process as in-county cases and will invite the other county to join meetings in person or over the phone.
How is your county currently tracking/collecting MDT data?	As our county hasn't had any CSEC yet, there has not been any CSEC data collected or tracked. A process will be developed in Child Welfare.

5. Assessment

Is your county currently using a specific assessment tool to identify children at risk or a victim of CSE? If yes, which tool are you using? If no, how are you assessing for children at risk or a victim of CSE?	We plan to begin using the CSE-IT assessment tool that was developed by WestCoast Children's Clinic.
How has the implementation of this assessment tool been helpful/successful?	We have not yet begun utilization of this tool.
What about this assessment tool has proved challenging? (i.e. over reporting, too long, etc.)	We need to obtain permission from WestCoast Children's Clinic before using this tool.
How has implementing this tool informed your approach to serving victims of CSE?	The tool provides guidance and reminders on specific indicators to look for.

6. Harm Reduction Informed Approaches

In the context of CSE, a harm reduction approach accepts that youth may continue to be exploited, may be unable or unwilling to leave the exploitative relationship and that any positive change in behavior is valuable in their journey towards leaving the exploiter.

How are harm reduction approaches reflected in the services that your county staff provide to CSEC? Are harm reduction approaches expected or required of the service providers in your county?	Though we recognize the need for Harm Reduction Informed Approaches, we have not yet identified any cases of CSEC.
---	--

Do service providers (foster care homes/facilities, mental health providers, etc) in your county implement harm reduction informed approaches? If so, please elaborate.	Child Welfare will make this training available to service providers, law enforcement and foster parents.
Are harm reduction informed approaches taken while implementing your MDTs? If so, how? (i.e. holding a MDT while youth is Absence Without Official Leave (AWOL))	In the MDT, the team addresses these approaches as a group and in regard to specific cases.
What are your current challenges in implementing this approach locally?	Creating a collaborative plan and training service providers. Low staffing and staff turnover have affected many county agencies, making it challenging to have the ability to focus on a new category.
What other approaches or models has your county and its service providers utilized to serve CSEC?	Unknown at this time. Community and county agencies have received training on Strengths-based approaches and motivational interviewing.
Please describe the benefits and challenges your county has experienced for these other approaches or models for serving CSEC.	Lack of a joint community protocol leads to a lack of information on how other service providers are serving this population.

7. Funding

The CDSS understands that counties statewide are experiencing challenges with expending funds allocated for the CSEC Program. One of the recurring challenges is the extended time required to execute contracts with community service providers and trainers. The CDSS also recognizes there are requests for allocation re-appropriation and there is a need for stabilized funding in order to appropriately budget for on-going specialized CSEC trainings and services. To ensure that the FY 2017-18 CSEC Program allocation methodology is consistent with counties' needs, please elaborate on how funds were spent in FY 2016-17 and spending plans for FY 2017-18 funds. Additionally, what approaches is your county taking to ensure the funds to be fully expended in FY 2017-18?

Please indicate how funds have been spent for the activities listed below for FY 2016-17. Specifically, please describe **in detail** any barriers or circumstances that prevented expending the funds in areas with low or non-existent percentages.

Activities	Percent Spent	Narrative
Specialized SWs/POs (i.e. hiring/training staff) to support CSEC, their caregivers, and the	0	We did not have an interagency protocol. Low-staffing in agencies contributed to a lack of focus on CSEC training and protocol implementation.

interagency and cross-departmental response		
Other staffing either in the county or via contract (i.e. MDT coordinators, CSE Survivor consultants, peer advocates/survivor advocates, etc.)	0	
Hiring and/or employment skills training for survivors of CSE	0	We do not have any identified survivors of CSE.
Outreach, education and training for non-specialized staff, community, youth, etc.	0	
Funding for victim services (i.e. youth incentives, tattoo removal, physical, educational or mental health/other services, etc.)	0	We did not have any identified CSEC cases.
Prevention services (i.e. addressing gang affiliation, homelessness, etc.)	0	
Supplemental payments to foster caregivers (i.e. payments to keep a bed open, patches to the foster care rate, respite care for providers, etc.)	0	
Ancillary funding (i.e. food for MDT meetings, supplies for MDT meetings, shared facility space, etc.)	0	MDT meetings are held in a county facility.

Please indicate how funds will be spent for the activities listed below for FY 2017-18. Specifically, please use the narrative space provided to describe how you plan to alleviate some of the above mentioned barriers your county has been experiencing in relation to spending challenges. Attached is the document “How to Spend CSEC Funding”, drafted by the Child Welfare Directors Association as a means of generating ideas for how your county can support survivors of CSE while utilizing Program funds in FY 2017-18.

Activities	Percent to Spend	Narrative
Specialized SWs/POs (i.e. hiring/training staff) to support CSEC, their caregivers, and the interagency and cross-departmental response	75	Bring in agency-specific trainers to train county departmentns. Law-enforcement, social services, mental health and probation staff will benefit from learning how to identify CSEC in their specific line of work.

		Bring in trainers to facilitate interagency trainers. Agency staff will be able to hear all of the same information, collaborate in cross-agency work groups, and learn specific details of when and how the agencies can work together to best serve CSEC.
Other staffing either in the county or via contract (i.e. MDT coordinators, CSE Survivor consultants, peer advocates/survivor advocates, etc.)		
Hiring and/or employment skills training for survivors of CSE		
Outreach, education and training for non-specialized staff, community, youth, etc.	25	Bring in Elle Snow from GAME OVER to speak to foster youth, train foster parents and train in the schools. Collaborate with Soroptimists for community-wide training.
Funding for victim services (i.e. youth incentives, tattoo removal, physical, educational or mental health/other services, etc.)		
Prevention services (i.e. addressing gang affiliation, homelessness, etc.)		
Supplemental payments to foster caregivers (i.e. payments to keep a bed open, patches to the foster care rate, respite care for providers, etc.)		
Ancillary funding (i.e. food for MDT meetings, supplies for MDT meetings, shared facility space, etc.)		
Other- Please explain		

The CDSS recognizes the need for funding stabilization in order for counties to appropriately budget and plan for the CSEC Program. In order to support the need for on-going funding and re-appropriation of unspent funds, please describe and provide **specific examples** of spending challenges relating to the CSEC Program allocation.

Spending Challenges
The lack of staff availability to coordinate county wide training and protocol has led to the CSEC funds not being utilized thus far. We plan to utilize the CSEC funds in 2017-2018 to

provide county wide training to all agencies and community members. The county wide training may lead to more substantiated or at-risk CSEC cases being identified.

8. Innovative and/or Promising Practices for FY 2017-18

In the FY 2016-17 County Plans, counties documented several barriers to effectively identify and serve victims and children at risk of CSE. Top barriers included: inadequate placement options, lack of prevention education, and challenges common to collaboration across systems. Many counties have addressed these challenges in unique and often promising ways.

What promising systemic practices have you implemented at the county level to address inadequate placement options?	Foster parent recruitment efforts have led to a greater number of resource family homes.
What promising systemic practices have you implemented at the county level to address the lack of prevention education?	Foster parents receive training on CSEC and serving potential victims of CSE.
What promising systemic practices have you implemented at the county level to address challenges common to collaboration across systems?	We are currently working on addressing this need.
What strategies or support is needed in order to mitigate/remove remaining barriers?	County-wide training. Top-down support and implementation of collaborate interagency protocol. Agency participation in resource mapping.

Counties indicated another challenge involved the identification and development of targeted services for at risk and identified (1) male victims, (2) Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, and Asexual (LGBTQIA) victims, and (3) CSEC victims who exploit other children.

How does your county address the needs of these three distinct populations? Please share your insight and elaborate on county policy changes or practice enhancements being explored.

Addressing the needs of identified and at risk (1) male and (2) LGBTQIA minor victims of CSE
Coastal Connections does offer a gender talk group; however, Child Welfare and Probation do not currently have data on these specific populations.

Addressing the needs of identified victims who become exploiters
--

We have not seen any cases in Del Norte County. The Resource Family Approval and Child Welfare staff remain aware of safety concerns for all children placed through the RFA process and continue to work with children and families for the safety of all involved.

9. Missing/Runaway Youth

With the passage of [SB 794](#), all County Child Welfare agencies and Probation Departments were required to develop and implement specific protocols to expeditiously locate any child missing from foster care. County Child Welfare and Probation Departments are additionally required to immediately, or in no care later than 24 hours from receipt of information, report to local law enforcement any known or suspected instance of commercial sexual exploitation of foster youth.

How does your county currently implement these mandates (i.e. What is your protocol)? Please describe any implementation challenges to these provisions.

Missing/Runaway youth protocols and reporting

Del Norte County is working on finalizing the local policy and protocol for working with missing and runaway youth.
CWS documents visits and contact attempts every month.

How is your county tracking missing/runaway youth qualitative data?

Missing/Runaway youth qualitative data tracking

As there are few cases of Missing/Runaway youth in Del Norte County, this data is not tracked.

How is your county tracking missing/runaway youth quantitative data?

Missing/Runaway youth quantitative data tracking

As there are few cases of Missing/Runaway youth in Del Norte County, this data is not tracked.

10. Technical Assistance

The CDSS Child Trafficking Response Unit will continue providing technical assistance via webinar on a bi-monthly basis. What are some topics of interest that your county would like to

see included in an upcoming webinar? (i.e. alleviating barriers to hiring survivors of CSE, harm reduction informed approaches for placement providers, etc.)

Technical Assistance Topics of Interest
We would like to know if there are resources available for training county staff on CSEC identification and prevention.
We would also like to know if there are any specific resources for rural counties who do not have many identified cases of CSEC.

County Child Welfare Director Printed Name and Title

County Child Welfare Director Signature

Date

Please submit an electronic copy of your County Plan no later than September 1, 2017 to CSECPprogram@dss.ca.gov. In addition, please send a hard copy of the County Plan, signed by the Director of the County Child Welfare services agency, must be postmarked September 1, 2017 to the address below. Faxes will not be accepted.

**California Department of Social Services
Child Welfare Policy and Program Development Bureau
Child Trafficking Response Unit
744 P Street, MS 8-11-87
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Counties must notify the CDSS if your county falls out of compliance with the provisions of [WIC Sections 16524.6 - 16524.11](#) (i.e., A partner leaves the interagency protocol or multidisciplinary team) or if a county chooses to discontinue the CSEC Program for any reason. Notifications with a detailed explanation must be submitted via email to: CSECPprogram@dss.ca.gov.