

WISCONSIN ANTI- HUMAN TRAFFICKING TASK FORCE

SCREENING & IDENTIFICATION WORKGROUP
RECOMMENDATIONS

December 7, 2016



Tim Baack, Pathfinders, Inc., Co-Chair
Emily Erickson, DCF, Co-Chair



SCREENING & IDENTIFICATION WORKGROUP: CHARGE

The charge of the Screening and Identification Workgroup is to identify:

- **A validated screening tool that can be used across systems throughout the state, including child welfare agencies, juvenile justice agencies, runaway and homeless shelters, and others.**

WORKGROUP REPRESENTATION

- **The Screening and Identification Workgroup included representation from multiple agencies and systems**
 - **Administrators, evaluators, direct service providers, policy staff**
 - **From a variety of disciplines**
 - **Child Welfare**
 - **Juvenile Justice**
 - **Law Enforcement**
 - **Education**
 - **Non-profit**
 - **Medical**
 - **Mental Health**

PHASE ONE

- **Identify and locate known screening and identification tools being used across the country**
- **Tools were not automatically eliminated based on validation status**
- **Tools that aligned with the Task Force's Guiding Principles were given equal consideration**
- **24 tools were located**
- **The tools were compiled in a centralized location**

PHASE ONE

- **Workgroup members organized the tools based on the following key elements:**
 - **Validation Status**
 - **Training Requirements**
 - **Target Population**
 - **Type of Trafficking Addressed**
 - **Target User**
 - **Adaptability of the Tool**
 - **Length of the Tool**
 - **Type of Tool (screening, assessment or indicator)**

PHASE ONE

- Each workgroup member was assigned a tool to review independently and then presented to the workgroup
- The tools that were found to be appropriate upon initial review were flagged for a closer look in Phase Two.

Sex Trafficking Identification and Screening Tool Evaluation

Tool Name: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Validated Tool (circle): YES NO UNKNOWN IN PROCESS

If YES, validated by: _____

Does it require training? YES or NO If YES, what level of training? Low Medium High

Target population (circle): Children/Youth Adults All

Addresses which (circle)? Labor Sex Both

Target user (circle): MH LE Medical CPS Advocates General JJ

Service Provider: _____ Educational staff

Can the tool be adapted for other target users: YES NO

How many questions on tool (circle): 0-10 11-20 21-30 31+

Average length of time (in minutes) to complete (circle): 0-20 21-40 41-60 60+ Unknown

Target use (check all that apply):

Screening and Identification

Assessment

Investigatory/Interview

MH/Trauma

Medical

Case Management

Recommended for Further Review? YES NO

PHASE ONE

- **Initial review of tools can be loosely classified into the following categories:**
 - **Indicator/Identification**
 - Least rigorous of the tools – can be completed very quickly
 - Easily used across systems
 - Usually a list of risk factors
 - Tell the user what to do next
 - Based on the information the user already has of the youth
 - **Screening**
 - Moderate amount of rigor
 - Involves observations and interviews with the youth
 - Includes direct input from and questioning of the youth
 - **Assessment**
 - Most rigorous of the tools
 - Gathers very detailed information about the youth and suspected incidents of trafficking
 - Most likely used by treatment providers
- **It was determined that the workgroup charge indicated that we are to review screening and identification tools**

PHASE TWO

- **The workgroup brainstormed additional qualities that would be important in a screening and identification tool, with consideration to the guiding principles**
- **Phase Two criteria were developed:**
 - **Ease of Use**
 - **Limited Training Required**
 - **Victim-Centered/Trauma Informed**
 - **Culturally/Gender Sensitive**
 - **Non-Investigatory**
 - **Evidence of Effectiveness**

PHASE TWO

Screening Tool Review form used by workgroup members

Ease of Use: Short, concise, able to be used across agencies easily

Limited Training Required: Does not require extensive training for the users

Victim Centered/Trauma Informed: Uses non-judgmental, victim-centered, strength based, and non-blaming (of victim OR suspect) language

Culturally & Gender Sensitive: Gender neutral (suspect and victim), LGBTQ sensitive, uses inclusive language, questions are sensitive to all developmental levels

Non-Investigatory: Does use investigative language or questions, more open-ended and narrative questions versus direct questions

Evidence of Effectiveness: Has the tool shown to be effective (regardless of validation)

Screening Tool Review

Screening Tool Information

Name of Tool	
Organization	
Date of Review	

Ratings

	1 = Poor	2 = Fair	3 = Satisfactory	4 = Good	5 = Excellent
Ease of Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Limited Training Required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Victim Centered/Trauma Informed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Culturally & Gender Sensitive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Non-Investigatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Evidence of Effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments					
Overall Rating (average the rating numbers above)					

Evaluation

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

DETERMINATION

Guidance for the Screening Tool Review

Ease of Use: Short, concise, able to be used across agencies easily

Limited Training Required: Does not require extensive training for the users

Victim Centered/Trauma Informed: Uses non-judgmental, victim-centered, strength based, and non-blaming (of victim OR suspect) language

Culturally & Gender Sensitive: Gender neutral (suspect and victim), LGBTQ sensitive, uses inclusive language, questions are sensitive to all developmental levels

Non-Investigatory: Does use investigative language or questions, more open-ended and narrative questions versus direct questions

Evidence of Effectiveness: Has the tool shown to be effective (regardless of validation)

PHASE TWO

- **The workgroup reviewed each tool that was flagged for further review in Phase One (12 tools)**
- **Workgroup members were asked to review each tool assigned using the review form**
- **Workgroup members discussed each member's scoring for each criteria**
- **Determined that Screening and Indicator Tools (Identification) should be considered separately, as not all disciplines will use the screening tool, but most will use the indicator tool**

PHASE THREE

- **Based on the scores for each tool, there were 3 screening tools and 2 indicator tools that scored highest**
- **The workgroup discussed these tools and came to a final conclusion on what tools would be recommended to the task force**
- **Tools being recommended are:**
 - **Indicator Tool: Safe Harbor, State of Minnesota: Sexual Exploitation/Trafficking Flowchart**
 - **Screening Tool: State of Louisiana Department of Human Services: Runaway, Missing or Kidnapped Assessment**

RECOMMENDED INDICATOR TOOL

- **Sexual Exploitation/Trafficking Flowchart: Safe Harbor, State of Minnesota**
 - The score was higher than any other indicator tool
 - Guides the user
 - Easy to implement across systems, broad application
 - Can easily “Wisconsinize” flowchart in regards to what to do with the information received
 - The framework behind this tool aligns with the Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force Guiding Principles

RECOMMENDED SCREENING TOOL

- **Runaway, Missing or Kidnapped Child Assessment: State of Louisiana Department of Human Services**
 - Scored the highest amongst other screening tools
 - Can easily “Wisconsinize”
 - Easy to implement
 - Few training requirements
 - Basic understanding of the dynamics of sex trafficking
 - Each question comes with instructions/purpose for the user
 - Majority of questions open ended, with some yes/no

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- **The Anti-Human Trafficking Guiding Principles that align with the charge of the Screening and Identification Workgroup and recommended tools are:**
 - *Individuals who have been trafficked should be treated with dignity, sensitivity and respect for their privacy.*
 - *Task force materials will be developed to be easily modified to be functional across different disciplines, agencies and systems.*
 - *State and national models and best practices will inform recommendations.*
 - *The impact of task force recommendations should be lasting and scalable and will incorporate tenets of primary prevention when applicable.*

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS

- **Confidentiality Statements need to be included with each tool as many using the tools are mandated reporters**
- **The tools will need to be “Wisconsinized” by the Wisconsin Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force**
 - **Validation status**
- **Although these tools were the best found during our thorough analysis, there may be other options on the horizon as more is learned about sex trafficking**

MATERIALS FOR YOUR REVIEW

- **Safe Harbor, State of Minnesota: Sexual Exploitation/Trafficking Flowchart**
- **State of Louisiana Department of Human Services: Runaway, Missing or Kidnapped Child Assessment**
- **Screening and Identification Workgroup Tools Matrix**
- **Phase One and Two Workgroup Evaluation Forms**
- **Workgroup Membership List**

THANK YOU

- **Tim Baack, Pathfinders Inc, Co-Chair**
- **Emily Erickson, DCF, Child Welfare Section Chief, Co-Chair**
- **Kimber Blum, DCF, Child Welfare PPA, Staff Lead**
- **Dawn Bucholz, WCHSA/Washara County Human Services**
- **Lindsay Wood, DCF, Out of Home Care PPA**
- **Bryn Martyna, DCF, Juvenile Justice PPA**
- **Bridget Bauman, Director CCIP**
- **Kathy Kucharski, Milwaukee County Court Commissioner**
- **Jessica Awe, DPI, Education Consultant**
- **Becky Kanitz, DHS**
- **Robin Stuht, School District of Beloit Homeless Liasion**
- **Paul Hestekind, DOC, STG Specialist**
- **Julia Stark, DOC**
- **John Bauman, Dane County Juvenile Court Commissioner**
- **Adam Nagel, Appleton Police Department School Liasion**
- **Jennifer Yates, MSN, Children's Hospital of WI**
- **Tamara Remington, Detective, Sheboygan Police Department**
- **Susan Piazza, DPI, School Administration Consultant**
- **Pnina Goldfarb, Milwaukee County**
- **Jean Geran, UW Streets Initiative**
- **Mariana Rodriguez, UMOS**
- **Michelle Mays, Oneida Law Office**
- **Tiffany Marie Wilhelm, Crisis Stabilization Program Coordinator**