



**The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:**

**Document Title:**           **Researcher-Survivor-Ally Evaluation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking, 2018 Final Process Report**

**Author(s):**                 **Alexandra Lutnick, Minh Dang**

**Document Number:**   **254006**

**Date Received:**         **October 2019**

**Award Number:**         **2015-VF-GX-0107**

**This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs’ National Criminal Justice Reference Service.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**

**August 2018**

# **Researcher-Survivor-Ally Evaluation of the Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking**

## **2018 Final Process Report**

Prepared by  
**alexandra lutnick**  
**Minh Dang**

RTI International  
351 California Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94104



RTI Project Number 0215039

This project was funded by grant 2015-VF-GX-0107 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Justice.

# Contents

---

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Methods</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. Findings</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1 Task Force Documents .....	2
3.1.1 Meetings .....	2
3.1.2 Annual Report.....	6
3.2 Key Informant Interviews.....	7
3.2.1 Strengths & Successes.....	7
3.2.2 Opportunities for Improvement.....	9
3.2.5 Future Directions.....	13
<b>4. Discussion and Recommendations</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 Discussion .....	15
4.2 Recommendations .....	16
4.2.1 Annual Report.....	16
4.2.2 Task Force Structure .....	16
4.2.3 Strategic Planning .....	17
4.2.4 Task Force Meetings .....	18

# Tables

---

<b>Number</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	General Meeting Attendance .....	3
2	Committee Attendance.....	4

## **1. BACKGROUND**

RTI International (RTI), in partnership with MD Consulting, was awarded a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct this evaluation of the Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking. The evaluation was led by Principal Investigators, Dr. alexandra lutnick and Ms. Minh Dang. This study was unique and innovative in that the most integrated approach of community involvement was utilized. People who have experienced a severe form of human trafficking are represented at all levels of the research process, including that of co-principal investigator (co-PI), research assistants (Ras) and members of the Community Advisory Board (CAB).

The goals of our evaluation were to evaluate components of task force implementation through a comprehensive process evaluation, and create a research infrastructure that supports the intellectual and career development of people who have experienced trafficking.

This report shares the final findings based on our observations of meetings, as well as from the interviews we conducted with Task Force participants and members. Final findings from the Levels of Collaboration Scale, and from the analysis of de-identified San Francisco Police Department and San Francisco District Attorney's Office data can be found in their respective reports.

## **2. METHODS**

Throughout the evaluation we attended all General Task Force meetings, at least the first meeting of each year for the committees, and reviewed the annual report. We also attended and participated in the day-long strategic planning sessions held in 2017 and 2018. We conducted in-depth interviews with Task Force participants and members.

For all meetings we attended, we wrote field notes about the topics discussed, process related observations, and other reflections about the meeting dynamics. For those meetings we did not attend, we reviewed meeting minutes as they were distributed.

In the first two rounds of key informant interviews we used quota sampling to ensure representation of members from each committee, newer members, and long-standing members. For the first round in 2016, we interviewed 31 individuals from 25 agencies. In the second round (2017), we interviewed 34 individuals from 25 agencies. In the final round, 2018, we interviewed the Co-Chairs of each committee (4 individuals) and representatives from the Department on the Status of Women (2 individuals).

The interview guide used was created by the research team with input from the survivor-ally CAB members. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and focused on the: a) organizational context of each agency; b) their involvement in the Task Force; c) actions of the Task Force and its goals; d) future plans and goals for the Task Force; and, e) perspectives on the evaluation.

Each interview was audio recorded with permission from the participants. We took notes during the interviews and used the audio recordings afterwards to ensure the accuracy of information. In the last round, we had the recordings transcribed. We e-mailed interviewees the notes or transcripts and asked them to verify their accuracy. In some cases, interviewees requested changes. After making those changes we finalized the interview notes/transcripts. For these interviews we summarized the interviews by question and then compared and contrasted responses across all interviewees.

## **3. FINDINGS**

### **3.1 Task Force Documents**

#### **3.1.1 Meetings**

Since the start of the evaluation, the Task Force has adopted a consistent system of note taking for meetings. The posting of committee meeting minutes is still sporadic. By the end of the evaluation, minutes for General meetings and for the Youth committee were all posted online. Those for the Adult committee and the Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact committee were not. Overwhelmingly though, minutes are sent to attendees via email prior to the next meeting. With the inconsistent posting of minutes, it can be hard for newer attendees to know what has already happened or is currently in progress.

Recognizing the extensive number of agencies and individuals on the listserv for the Task Force, in May 2018 the Human Trafficking Fellow initiated a project to confirm that people were still interested in receiving email communication from the Task Force. That correspondence also asked recipients to indicate whether they wanted to receive notifications from any of the Task Force committees (Adult; Youth; Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact Committee) or for the Data Workgroup.

Table 1 shows attendance trends for the General meeting since the inception of the Task Force through the end of 2017. The number of agencies attending the General Meetings continues to rise. Almost half of the agencies participating in General Meetings in 2017 are new agencies. The median number of General Meetings attended remained at two (2) meetings.

**Table 1: General Meeting Attendance**

	<b># of Agencies</b>	<b>Median # of Meetings Attended (range)*</b>	<b>Median # of People from Each Agency (range)</b>
<b>2013</b>	32	2 (1-5)	1 (1-5)
<b>2014</b>	37 (6 new, 9 gone)	3 (1-6)	2 (1-7)
<b>2015</b>	39 (12 new, 14 gone, 3 returned)	2 (1-5)	1 (1-7)
<b>2016</b>	52 (21 new, 13 gone, 2 returned)	2 (1-6)	1 (1-8)
<b>2017</b>	56 (23 new, 14 gone, 1 returned)	2 (1-5)	1 (1-11)

### ***Committees***

The Task Force has three Committees: Youth, Adult, and Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact. During the course of the evaluation, the CSEC Committee was renamed the Youth Committee, with the intention to address all types of trafficking that youth might experience, not just trafficking in commercial sex. The same intention was true for changing the Labor Committee to the Adult Committee. Table 2 provides information about Committee meeting attendance. The table also compares attendance from 2016 to 2017.

### ***Youth Committee***

This committee is co-chaired by Ifasina Clear and Alia Whitney-Johnson. Since 2017, the co-chairs have run the meetings, created the agendas, put together meeting minutes, and worked to maintain accountability among committee members. Over the course of the evaluation this committee did the formative work necessary to support the inclusion of the Youth Advisory Board members, culminating with their inclusion and continued involvement as of the beginning of 2018. In addition to the key achievement of incorporating people who have been impacted by trafficking, the Committee also developed and presented their Housing and Placement recommendations to the General Task Force and had them approved by the voting members.

**Table 2: Committee Attendance**

	<b># of Agencies</b>	<b>Median # of Meetings Attended (range)</b>	<b>Median # of People from Each Agency (range)</b>
<b>Adult</b>	17 (7 new, 9 gone, 1 returned)	2 (1-4)	1 (1-3)
<b>Youth</b>	32 (10 new, 9 gone)	3 (1-6)	2 (1-8)
<b>Sex Work and Trafficking Policy Impact</b>	11 (3 new)	2 (1-5)	1 (1-6)

### ***Adult Committee***

This committee lacks co-chairs. Currently Victoria Chan assists with the logistics of the meeting. For the past two years this committee largely focused on trafficking in non-commercial sex industries. The primary focus of the work was the Healthy Nails Salon program, the Stanford Online training, outreach to employees at massage establishments, and the Good Food Purchasing program. By the end of the evaluation, the Healthy Nails Salon program has made significant progress towards being implemented, with the most recent step being getting the info about which salons are certified onto open data. This achievement will help link the certification to Yelp profiles to increase consumer awareness. Because of a California Supreme Court Ruling which reclassified nail technicians as employees, some of the previously finalized content needs to be updated. The Stanford Online training was completed and made available online. According to the Task Force’s 2017 Annual Report, 732 certificates of completion have been awarded. The Good Food Purchasing Program which promotes ethical and sustainable food purchasing for large organizations, was finalized and passed as a resolution by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in June 2018.

### ***Sex Work & Trafficking Policy Impact Committee***

As of 2017, Saerom Choi co-chairs this committee with Minouche Kandel. The primary focus of this Committee has been developing and implementing the *Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy*. Although the Policy was quickly approved by the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, it took much longer for the Police Department to issue their bulletin. As of

December 2017 the SFPD issued their bulletin. An outreach event was held, and a working group is developing a training for the SFPD. The SF Policy inspired the introduction of State legislation which was passed in June 2018. Although this Committee has accomplished quite a lot, there seems to be an unwillingness among its participants to take on more work and leadership. Beyond the work on the *Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy*, the committee does not have specified goals.

### ***Executive Committee***

The Executive Committee was established during the January 2017 Strategic Planning retreat and held its first meeting in May 2017. When it was formed, the purpose of this Committee was to focus on the Task Force infrastructure, and education and advocacy efforts developed within the Task Force. The committee aims were to:

- Develop a process for adopting and implementing policies across departments
- Identify stakeholders and involve new actors
- Create membership and voting rules for Task Force
- Help create agendas for the general Task Force meetings
- Create an infrastructure to support the goals of the Task Force
- Brief local and state elected officials on Task Force priorities, policies, and gaps identified
- Create a webinar showcasing best practices
- Connect with other sanctuary cities
- Advocate for dedicated funding for anti-human trafficking campaigns and organizations

To date, the committee has developed and adopted membership rules. Those guidelines were implemented in 2018 and going forward membership will be on a rolling basis. As of the beginning of 2018 though, the Committee only meets on an as-needed basis. It is unclear how they are working towards the identified aims above without ongoing meetings.

### ***Data Workgroup***

The Data Workgroup was formed in 2017 to improve the Task Force's data collection on human trafficking in San Francisco. In that year it met several times to explore methods of estimating the prevalence of young people experiencing human trafficking, and some possible solutions which would allow the Task Force to collect unduplicated numbers from the various agencies that serve trafficked youth. Researchers Paul Wesson of UCSF and Jessie Brunner of Stanford University were helping with these efforts. Very few meetings of this workgroup were held in 2018 primarily, it seems, because of capacity issues within the Task Force.

## ***Youth Advisory Board***

The Youth Advisory Board launched in 2017 in response to the identified goal of increasing survivor involvement on the Task Force. The Board is co-facilitated by Alia Whitney-Johnson from Freedom FWD and Ifasina Clear from the Young Women’s Freedom Center. Freedom FWD is the fiscal sponsor, and youth who participate receive a \$5000 stipend for their involvement. Six youth, ages 16-24, participate in 24 sessions throughout the year. As part of their involvement they engage in leadership development, participate on the Task Force, and create a project. In 2018, members of the Youth Advisory Board started attending Youth Committee meetings, and then some have attended General meetings. The co-facilitators of the Board worked to prepare both the young people and the other Task Force participants for their inclusion.

### ***3.1.2 Annual Report***

Over the course of this evaluation, each iteration of the Task Force’s annual report improves upon that of the prior year. In earlier versions of the report, the number of reported sex trafficking cases greatly outnumbered those of labor trafficking. Because of the concerted effort of the Task Force to include more agencies focused on trafficking outside of the sex industry, 2017’s report showed the reported number of identified cases of labor or sex trafficking to be quite similar (44% and 48% respectively).

The report for 2017 offered some notable new inclusions that strengthened the quality of the report:

- 1) The Task Force used typologies of trafficking to allow for a more nuanced understanding of trafficking. Seven of the 18 reporting agencies provided data using the typologies.
- 2) This report marked the first instance where the Task Force has attempted an unduplicated count. Using data from Family and Children’s Services and the Huckleberry Advocacy Response Team, allowed for this calculation of CSEC youth.
- 3) It offered a beginning glimpse into restitution for people who have experienced trafficking.
- 4) It included new data sources:
  - a. Comparing the demographics of survivors to the overall demographics of San Francisco City and County.

- b. The number of trafficking cases the District Attorney's Office has charged, number of convictions by plea bargain or trial, and pending case load.
  - c. Number of U- and T-visas issued by the SVU at SFPD.
- 5) The report shared progress towards the identified goals of the Task Force, as well as an update about agencies' progress towards developing CSEC protocols.

Throughout the evaluation, several key limitations of these reports have remained. The data are still duplicated, aside from the unduplicated count calculated from data provided by FCS and HART. Although guidance was given to use the TVPA definition for a severe form of human trafficking, the report acknowledges that "subjectivity is a factor in how providers classify cases." Data reporting inconsistencies still exist. Not all agencies provide complete data. The inclusion of progress towards goals was a helpful addition, but aside for information about the Stanford on-line training, no metrics for goals were included.

## **3.2 Key Informant Interviews**

### **3.2.1 Strengths & Successes**

Over the course of this evaluation, the Task Force made several key changes that have enhanced its functioning.

It was rare that interviewees spoke specifically about the specific Committees when sharing their perspectives about the strengths of the Task Force. We found a few exceptions. One was the Youth Committee. Since 2017, interviewees spoke highly about the organization, facilitation, productivity, and the inclusion of the Youth Advisory Board for this Committee. Related to productivity, interviewees highlighted the benefits of the Committee conducting working meetings to leverage the skills and knowledge in the room, and also to account for the reality that very few people have time to spend on Task Force related activities outside of the meetings. They also acknowledged that this format, with lots of breakout groups, creates an environment that makes it easier for a diversity of people to participate. As one interviewee reflected:

*I think it allows everybody to contribute, not just the young people, but I think it helps, it's just a more organic environment and a more inclusive environment for a young person to step into. And you're part of a team, you're, you're working on something concrete, it's not like the whole room's staring at you down a big table. You're like actually building and working together and asking each other questions and smaller circles.*

In regard to the Youth Advisory Board, interviewees stressed the importance of the preparatory work done by the co-chairs with the Youth Committee. A full 90-minute

meeting was dedicated to preparing people to "*welcome the young people more intentionally into the space.*" This concerted effort and intentionality allowed for a smoother introduction of the Board members into this Committee.

Since its formation, many interviewees point to the Youth Advisory Board as a crucial addition to the Task Force. Although the Board exists outside of the Task Force, because its facilitators are also the co-chairs of the Youth Committee it has been incorporated into that Committee with great success. With the Board comes diverse leadership, consistent respect for differing perspectives, and the input of young people who have been impacted by trafficking. Crucial is that the Board members are paid for their involvement, and that at their meetings they gather around a meal. Within this model the co-facilitators are paid for their work, and professional emotional support is provided for both the members and the co-facilitators.

The Task Force developed and formalized membership and voting criteria. Before this was implemented the structure was to approve action items by consensus among whomever was at a meeting. Membership is now based on attendance at the General and at least one Committee, with those meeting the criteria having voting power.

In October 2017, the DOSW hired Rachel Chambers to be the Anti-Trafficking Fellow for their department. In that role, Ms. Chambers has made significant improvements that help the functioning of the Task Force. Although she started at three days a week, it became clear early on that more time was needed and her position was expanded to four days a week. Ms. Chambers, among many other deliverables, developed the tracking mechanism for membership, cleaned up the listserv for the Task Force and its committees, ensured a consistent note taking style across meetings, helped facilitate more timely posting of meeting minutes, assisted with the Annual Report, as well as with organizing community events. Stepping into her position at the beginning she realized that all the information she needed to know how best to do this work were scattered. She ensured that her predecessor will not have to go through the same thing, and there was a period of overlap between her and the new fellow to ensure a "*warm hand-off.*"

Some significant changes have also been implemented around tracking goals and outcomes. Although we were not able to do an outcome evaluation for this project, it is important to note that initially the Task Force was lacking clear goals and metrics. Since the beginning of 2018, Minouche Kandel has been maintaining a dashboard to track the progress towards the prioritized actions that were established either in the Strategic Planning Retreat or by the individual Committees. Most meetings are now structured around these action items.

## **Diversity of participants and orientations**

Throughout the evaluation, people continued to name as a strength that the Task Force consistently convenes a group of committed people from diverse sectors across the city. Many interviewees indicated that merely bringing together the same partners over a multi-year period is a strength. The General Task Force meetings bring many of the key anti-human trafficking players together, including representatives from sectors that participants do not see at other cities' task force meetings. But it is also the orientation of the Task Force, in addition to the attendees, that people named as being key. As one interviewee stated, *"My background familiarity with task forces has always been very law enforcement heavy, so this is probably the first time I've seen a task force where the service providers have been the primary steerers."* Participants applauded the Task Force's inclusion of sex workers, and continue to stress the importance of their inclusion.

Another strength identified by interviewees is that the Task Force provides networking opportunities that facilitate collaborations. One mechanism for facilitating these collaborations is the agency presentations at meetings, specifically when they are about services available for survivors, or when they lead to a deepening understanding of human trafficking as a complex issue.

## **The DOSW and the Mayor's Office**

The leadership from the DOSW continued to be named as a key strength. Primarily this was attributed to the DOSW welcoming multiple perspectives, supporting the inclusion of sex worker and youth voices, and facilitating access to city agencies. Those we interviewed also believe that the commitment and overall spirit of cooperation among Task Force participants is because the DOSW, a city department, convenes the Task Force. They felt that this same spirit would not exist if it was a law enforcement led Task Force. Overwhelmingly, those interviewed expressed their gratitude for all that the DOSW does, in particular Minouche Kandel, and also for the work of colleagues on the Task Force. As one interviewee reflected, *"It's good to be alongside such good people."*

People also highlighted the importance that the Task Force is convened by the Mayor of San Francisco. These individuals felt that having the Mayor's endorsement gives the Task Force a sense of *"importance and urgency,"* and creates a greater likelihood that city funding may be available when key needs are identified by the Task Force.

### **3.2.2 Opportunities for Improvement**

Interviewees shared their perspectives about areas of improvement for the Task Force. The identified opportunities for improvement fall into three broad categories: Task Force Infrastructure, Individual Capacity and Participation, and Direction and Focus.

## **Funding & Capacity**

The 50% FTE Policy Director and the part-time human trafficking fellow, are the only paid positions that specifically support the Task Force. Both of these positions are with the DOSW. As such, throughout the evaluation interviewees continuously named limited capacity as a key challenge. The Task Force was established to bring existing anti-trafficking players together, yet understandably the individual capacity of each key player varies. Since Task Force participation is not a required job function for most people, and is something they fit in to an already full schedule, prioritizing meeting attendance or volunteering for leadership roles and additional responsibilities is difficult. Participants appear to only take on more responsibilities if it is compatible to their other job functions and objectives. Consequently, many interviewees identified the lack of attendance and leadership of Committees as an ongoing challenge for them and others. As one interviewee shared:

*There's not, without sounding critical there's not a lot of organic leadership that's coming up in that group, and I don't think it's to say that these people are not "leaders," but like in this space people are not wearing that hat and don't want to and don't have the energy to.*

The limited funding dedicated to the Task Force means that no funding is allocated to the programmatic work or collaborative projects that arise out of the Task Force. Fundraising becomes an added responsibility for either the Women's Policy Director or a volunteer from the Task Force.

## **Task Force Infrastructure**

During the course of the evaluation, the Mayor's Office was largely absent from the Task Force meetings. At the end of 2017, Mayor Edwin Lee died unexpectedly. It is understandable that following that the Mayor's Office had a lot of pressing priorities. However, interviewees consistently named wanting clarity about the role of the Mayor's Office on the Task Force, as well as more involvement from the Mayor's Office. At the end of 2017, the Mayor's Office reported that it viewed itself as just another participant on the Task Force, and not a lead organization. The sentiment among other Task Force participants remains though. They feel *"it would be great if there was somebody at a high level position in the Mayor's Office that did attend the meetings and could be a direct conduit about what's happening...[I]t would be nice if there was more participation."*

With the diversity of participants on the Task Force, at times the power differentials of who is in the room impedes the process. Sometimes social service providers do not feel comfortable sharing their critiques of proposed projects when those projects are linked to their funders and/or collaborative partners. In those situations, they feel like it would compromise their working relationships with their partners, or negatively impact future funding opportunities. As Minouche Kandel reflected:

*There are going to be city departments that are funding community based organizations and you want those community based organizations that are being funded to be at the*

*table because they're doing the work. So you can't eliminate those perceived or actual tensions. I think you can only acknowledge them and, and try to create some comfort.*

The Task Force operates under an open attendance structure. The open meeting structure results in inconsistent attendance, lack of shared institutional knowledge, culture clashes, differing perspectives about what constitutes trafficking and how best to respond. These dynamics are challenges that are navigated at almost every meeting. It was common to hear things like, *"folks see trafficking on very different wavelengths"*, *"with the diversity of people I think there's probably going to be an inevitable culture clash"*, and *"I don't really like that I felt at some point I might be off task."* That last statement was made by someone who felt like certain topics, particularly the decriminalization of people who sell sex, are not welcomed by the DOSW and other Task Force participants. The Task Force does not offer an orientation for new attendees, nor does it require agencies to appoint one or two people to represent them at the meetings.

In 2018, based on the membership criteria developed by the Executive Committee, some agencies became formal members of the Task Force. All members have voting privileges. Because the criteria is based on attending a certain number of General and Committee meetings, some agencies and individuals will never be eligible because of their limited General Meeting attendance. Some raised the concern that the criteria for membership makes it very hard for people with lived experiences to ever become members. As one interviewee reflected:

*if we're saying verbally we want to be inclusive and we want to be centered in lived experience, our, everything about that, I mean, from a process and rules standpoint, needs to reflect that, including whose voice matters when it comes time to take a vote.*

Although the creation of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) was identified at the strategic planning session in January 2017, they still do not exist. Without them, interviewees named the difficulties of ensuring accountability among Task Force participants. Similarly, without the MOUs, the Task Force does not have a mechanism to ensure that new representatives from agencies are identified when there is staff turnover.

Since 2017, all of the Committees have at least one person outside of the DOSW as a chair. Some of the people chairing Committees named that they were not provided with an orientation or training prior to assuming the role. In a perfect world, co-chairs outside of the DOSW would receive financial compensation for their work. Whether or not the positions are paid, it is crucial that co-chairs receive training and support, and also have a deep understanding of the Task Force and the ways in which to move action items forward. More and more, Task Force participants are wanting to better understand how to make the best use of the *"power, resources, and knowledge in the room; how to leverage the power and funding in the City and County of San Francisco."* To date, no formal conversations have occurred about how best to do this.

In 2018, the Youth Advisory Board started attending the General Meetings of the Task Force. Their integration brought to the surface the ways in which the meeting is inaccessible to many, and lacking in diversity among the attendees. Many find the culture of the meetings to be inaccessible, particularly the General Meeting. Some even feel that they are *"almost structured to keep folks like me out of the room."* Although the Youth Advisory Board is a positive step towards full inclusion of people who have experienced or been impacted by trafficking, the Task Force needs to continue its commitment to peer involvement and leadership. Overwhelmingly the meetings are attended by *"straight, privileged, cisgender women"* resulting in many naming the need for meaningful inclusion of Black transwomen, and young gay men. But, as one person noted, *"it ain't going to happen the way things are structured."*

### **Participation of Law Enforcement**

The tension around law enforcement involvement on the Task Force remained throughout the evaluation. The perspectives range from (1) people see the tensions but understand the need for law enforcement and community providers to hear each other and work together, (2) people do not want law enforcement present at all, and (3) law enforcement agencies feel they are singled out and people only focus on the negative aspects of their work. By the end of the evaluation, non-law enforcement representatives were more aligned with the first perspective. As one person who works at a social service agency shared:

*the field is becoming already very hostile to law enforcement...We have to figure out a way to keep folks in law enforcement engaged with us at least.... have to work collaboratively with law enforcement so they can listen to us...If they're like a separate group and we decide to collectively come together and [ask for something], if they don't know the context of where we're coming from then there's no reason for them to oblige us I guess.*

Many participants see the importance of non-law enforcement agencies hearing from law enforcement and vice-versa. However, they identify the key challenges with this as the different groups not understanding one another's objectives and motives. Likewise, people named the challenge for people who have lived experience when police officers show up while on duty wearing their uniform and gun. Some law enforcement partners spoke to how they feel excluded at the meetings and limited by the structure. A few voiced their preference for a law enforcement specific Committee where they could discuss active cases.

### **Direction and Focus**

Throughout the evaluation many commented that there is not enough focus on labor trafficking. Although the intent of renaming the Committees to Youth and Adult was to encourage focusing on all types of trafficking, some interviewees feel like the focus is still overwhelmingly on trafficking in the sex industry. Some have asked that the Task Force be,

*"mindful of how they can be more inclusive of other groups, especially immigrants."* Others have highlighted how some of the work initially starts of including the diversity of people who experience trafficking (young people and adults; citizens, lawful permanent residents, and people here without documentation; people experiencing trafficking in all labor sectors). However, as the work progresses it is understandably informed by the perspectives and funding priorities of *"those who can influence the recommendations moving forward."* At that point the scope of who is included becomes much narrower and seemingly always ends up on *"youth and sex trafficking."*

### **Gaps in Services**

Overwhelmingly, interviewees named housing, sustainable and viable employment, and coordinated care as the key gaps in San Francisco County. Housing needs include crisis housing, foster care placement services within the city of San Francisco, and long-term affordable housing options. Employment needs include vocational training, and viable, living wage, opportunities. Interviewees also spoke of the concentration of services for commercially sexually exploited children, leaving a huge gap in services for other trafficking victims, inclusive of foreign nationals, adults, cisgender men, and transgender individuals.

### **3.2.3 Future Directions**

The Task Force has indicated that it would like to continue hosting an annual Strategic Planning Retreat. Although they have not found the best facilitator, they are working towards identifying someone for 2019. Task Force participants want to identify SMART goals (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant/realistic, and timely), with meetings continuing to be structured around the goals and timelines in which to achieve them.

Although interviewees are asking for the Task Force to follow through on established plans, they also called for a certain level of flexibility within the Task Force to be more responsive to current trends. Specifically, people noted the need for the Task Force to enhance its focus on people who are in San Francisco County without documentation. They would, *"like to see an adaptation of the Task Force to reflect how the immigrant and undocumented communities are impacted now. Worried we will see more people in the shadows, engaged in illicit industries, because of immigration policies."*

Many people spoke to wanting to see the Task Force become more involved in policy work and conducting policy impact assessments. They want the Task Force to have a policy agenda that is data informed, focuses on vulnerable populations (sex workers, migrants, youth), reduces the criminalization of people who are trafficked, and reduces institutional and interpersonal violence. Noting that sometimes policies and responses may not always produce the desired outcomes, interviewees also want the task force to conduct impact assessments. People suggested that assessments be conducted on the following: what

impact the City's massage ordinance has on the ability to open legal businesses; the 24-hour CSEC response; the Prioritizing Safety for Sex Workers Policy; the benefits and limitations of the current multidisciplinary team process; and the impacts of human trafficking poster campaigns.

Overwhelmingly, those interviewed voiced their growing frustration about how it feels like the Task Force is asking more of them without providing any financial support for their increased efforts. Suggestions were made that the Task Force needs to lobby the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and foundations to direct funding to these efforts.

### **Evaluation Specific Feedback**

Throughout the project we have elicited feedback about the evaluation itself. Largely people focused on what they perceive to be the continued strengths of the evaluation. Most interviewees offered that the evaluation provides an important opportunity for reflection and self-examination, which reinforces what is working well, and provides an opportunity to rethink strategies and approaches being used. Some felt that the iterative process we used, where we shared findings on an ongoing basis, was a strength. These people shared that the process helped guide the task force's actions, motivated the task force to mobilize and achieve its goals, and helped the task force move towards increased professionalization. Still others noted the rarity in which these types of evaluations are conducted, and how appreciative they were that the evaluation was occurring. As one interviewee reflected, *"it's very rare that we get to have this kind of evaluation of it, in real-time especially, so it's been invaluable."* Lastly, some noted how the evaluation became a platform that ensured their perspectives were heard and considered, something that they did not feel happened in the meetings. As one person shared, the evaluation, *"allows us to have a voice and hopefully they [the Task Force] will listen and hear some of our frustrations to make this a better working project."*

Overwhelmingly, people did not have concerns about the evaluation. A few shared the concern that it will not get used and will be *"just another report on the shelf."* One interviewee named the concern about what happens if the findings do not reflect positively on the Task Force, while another noted that the time frame is not long enough to truly measure outcomes. Some interviewees reflected that their concern is about who gets credit for the work being done, because they are *"unsure what part of the work can be attributed to the Task Force versus work done collaboratively outside of the Task Force."*

## 4. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 Discussion

Information learned during this evaluation illustrates continued successful strategies for Task Force operations as well as reoccurring challenges. The Mayor's Task Force has engaged with the evaluators in an iterative process. A variety of perspectives are represented in this report because of our data collection methods. We collected quantitative data through the Levels of Collaboration Scale and Meeting Attendance tracking (done in conjunction with the DOSW). Our qualitative data comes from meeting observations, interviews with Task Force participants and members, and reviewing meeting minutes. Again, the participatory approach ensured that the methods and data collection tools were informed by people who have experienced trafficking. A key limitation of this evaluation is that the participants and actions of this Task Force may not represent those of other task forces throughout the United States.

In the context of these strengths and limitations, we offer several summary observations.

The DOSW continues to receive praise for its commitment to the Task Force. Overall, Task Force participants continue to express interest and motivation to collaborate with each other; however, the lack of resources for the collaborations continues to be a concern and prohibitive barrier. Participants lament that change to institutional structures takes a long time, and if the work of the Task Force is slow due to lack of participation and overloaded attendees, this lengthens the timeframe of achievable impact and outcomes.

Much of the work happens in the Committees, but some agencies who attend the General Meetings never attend Committee meetings and vice-versa. This raises the question of whether Committees are representative of the larger Task Force and whether the larger Task Force is representative of Committees. Additionally, the leadership and structure of each Committee varies widely, and *"there is no direct guidance on how to be in that role [of Co-Chair]."*

The Task Force continues to release an Annual Report, and in its third year, the report still provides duplicated counts of the number of people served by anti-trafficking service providers. There are some notable improvements in the report, such as an attempted unduplicated number provided by two Task Force participating agencies, inclusion of information about prosecuted trafficking cases, and progress updates about identified goals. Some of the challenges seen in previous years' reports remain. These include limited participation among agencies that could report data, inconsistent data reporting among agencies that do provide data, and inaccurate data reporting. It is possible that some of these recommendations are being addressed in the forthcoming annual report.

When asked what concerns people had about the evaluation, the primary response was that there were no concerns, or that nothing will happen with the evaluation findings. Interviewees were appreciative of the opportunity to share their feedback and ideas about the Task Force and expressed a sense of possibility that the Task Force would use the feedback to improve.

Interviewees also expressed that the evaluation may be having a positive impact in pushing the Task Force to hold itself accountable, and would like to continue to receive progress updates about the evaluation along the way.

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

## **4.2 Recommendations**

### **4.2.1 Annual Report**

We offer the following recommendations:

- 1) Continue to work towards having an unduplicated count across reporting agencies.
- 2) Explore ways to get more agencies reporting data and more complete data submitted by agencies.
- 3) Create a plan with the San Francisco Police Department to ensure they can submit valid data.
- 4) Expand reporting of restitution efforts to include data about the number of expungements and civil remedies achieved in the calendar year.
- 5) Further develop the reporting of progress towards goals to include more nuanced measurements, as well as impact of actions.

### **4.2.2 Task Force Structure**

Considering that the Task Force is staffed by one 50% FTE position, and a part-time Fellow, it is remarkable what it has been able to achieve. We continue to hear from Task Force participants about the ask for more Task Force related work without financial compensation and support for those efforts. Similarly, as the Task Force continues to grow, and develops more specific, measurable goals, it will become increasingly more difficult for one or two people from the DOSW to manage it all.

Our recommendations related to the Task Force Structure, as informed by our interviews with Task Force participants, are:

- Staffing. In addition to the 50% FTE position and part-time Fellow, the Task Force would benefit tremendously from additional paid support. This could be in the form of formalizing relationships with co-Chairs and paying them for their work. It could also be in the form of creating another 50% FTE position for a project manager. This person would be tasked with ensuring that the Committees are working towards their goals, doing all the necessary follow-up calls to ensure forward movement. Funding to support the ongoing efforts of the Task Force could be solicited from the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, or Foundations.

- Membership. The Executive Committee developed membership criteria and the Task Force has begun formalizing relationships with those who are eligible. The Task Force has indicated that membership enrollment will now be on a rolling basis.
  - It will be important for the Task Force to see which agencies are eligible based on Committee attendance, but not eligible because of limited General Meeting attendance. Another consideration is that the only people required to attend the General Meetings are Committee co-chairs. That person would share updates and then report back to the other committee members what was presented at the General Meeting that may be of interest.
  - The Task Force will also need to consider membership retention and the impact of staff transitions within member organizations. If key partner organizations fail to attend General Meetings, how will the Task Force engage with them moving forward? If key individual leaders were ensuring that an agency participate, how does the Task Force help to institutionalize that another person from that agency takes part in the Task Force?
  - With the diversity of participants on the Task Force comes a diversity of perspectives. It is becoming increasingly important that the Task Force clearly establishes its philosophical underpinning. When agencies are approached to formalize their membership, they would need to indicate that they are in alignment with the operating principles of the Task Force. This will further establish common ground among members and prevent "*rehashing the same arguments over and over and over again.*"
  
- Clarity about role of the Mayor's Office/who convenes the Task Force. Most people we interviewed want to see more involvement from the Mayor's Office. This is because they consider the Task Force to be the Mayor's Task Force, and that that association provides an elevated platform and legitimacy to their work. The Mayor's Office, however, sees itself as just another participant on the Task Force. As the Task Force enters its fifth year, and with a new Mayor leading San Francisco, conversations are needed to clarify the role of the Mayor's Office.

### **4.2.3 Strategic Planning**

Overwhelmingly, interviewees highlighted the continued need for strategic planning. Although in 2017 and 2018 retreats were held, the facilitators were not the best fits for what people hoped would be achieved. With greater clarity about the skill sets and knowledge base that

will best serve this work, it is likely that things will improved at the next strategic planning session.

- Work toward SMART goals. The majority of those we interviewed highlighted how most of the current goals are too broad, difficult or impossible to measure, and/or lacking in specificity about steps needed to achieve them. Refining the current goals (or developing new ones) that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant/realistic, and timely is needed. Likewise, clear timelines with assigned point people will help move the Task Force towards goal achievement
  - It is worth considering creating separate goals for the DOSW specifically related to their task of facilitating the Task Force.
- Develop goal measurement methods. Many of the people we interviewed would like to see the Task Force move beyond measurements that are simple counts or yes/no responses to goal achievement. Instead they, as we reported in last year's report, would like more impact measurements to help guide the work. For example, they want to know if trainings resulted in more people who have experienced trafficking being identified and linked to services, or if programs or policies that have been implemented are having the desired impact.
- Have Committees meet before the Strategic Planning Session to elicit input from the participating agencies. Not everyone can attend the strategic planning retreats, and it is at the Committee level that the work happens. Therefore, committees will want to meet beforehand and come to the session prepared to share the collectively created goals for their Committee.

#### **4.2.4 Task Force Meetings**

Nearly every month of the year different Task Force meetings are held. Not all Committees have members that attend the General Meeting. All meetings are open to the public which means at many meetings, especially the General Meeting, it is common to have new attendees present. Many of the meetings spend a lot of time on report backs and/or presentations. It is rare that meetings, except the Youth Committee meetings, are working meetings where participants spend time working on an action item.

We offer the following recommendations:

- Provide an orientation for new attendees. We made this recommendation throughout the evaluation. It was also identified as an action item by the Executive Committee. At the time of this writing it has not been developed. The

recommendation remains. See our Formative Report from 2016 for more details about what such an orientation would cover.

- Address barriers to survivors' participation and attendance. Build on the work of the Youth Advisory Board and determine what the Task Force needs to do in order to increase the participation of people with lived experience. For example, consider how to address the potential intimidation of attending meetings at City Hall, and the challenge for people to attend meetings in the middle of the work day if their work is not for an anti-trafficking organization.