

Victims of Human Trafficking in the Midwest:

Grant Numbers: 2003-VT-BX-K002 & 2003-VT-BX-K003

***2003-2005 Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation
Commissioned by the Office for Victims of Crime,
Department of Justice***

April 2006

*Prepared by:
The Mid-America Institute on Poverty of Heartland Alliance*

*Research and Manuscript By:
Curtis Jones
Paulette Yousefzadeh*

*For more information Contact:
Curtis Jones
Mid-America Institute on Poverty
4411 N. Ravenswood Ave.
Chicago, IL 60622
cjones@heartlandalliance.org*

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 2

Needs Assessment

 Geographic Data Analysis 4

 Summary Findings

 Service Provider Needs..... 11

 Summary Findings

 Law Enforcement Needs..... 16

 Summary Findings

 Conclusions and Recommendations..... 22

Interim Program Evaluation

 Impact Overview..... 23

 MIHRC Client Data Analysis..... 24

 Case Management & Social Services..... 28

 Legal Services..... 29

 Community Outreach & Training..... 31

 Changes in Policy and Practice..... 33

 Summary Findings..... 34

 Conclusions and Recommendations..... 35

References..... 37

Appendix – Project Tools..... 38

Victims of Human Trafficking in the Midwest: 2003-2005 Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

In 2003-2005, Heartland Alliance for Human Needs & Human Rights (Heartland Alliance) implemented the Midwest Counter-Trafficking Program with funding from the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) of the Department of Justice. Heartland Alliance's Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP) and Midwest Immigrant & Human Rights Center (MIHRC) prepared this Needs Assessment and MAIP subsequently conducted an independent Program Evaluation of MIHRC as commissioned by OVC. These deliverables have been integrated into one document.

Needs Assessment

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to identify unmet needs of trafficking victims in the Midwest. Specifically, the Needs Assessment seeks to obtain a clearer understanding of where trafficking victims are likely to be found in the Midwest and the preparedness of service providers and law enforcement entities to address human trafficking in their communities.

Interim Evaluation

MIHRC has completed its third year serving as the primary legal and social service provider/coordinator for potential victims of trafficking in the Midwest and as the information and training resource for human trafficking-related issues in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin. This report evaluates the efforts of MIHRC in light of its stated goals: to provide legal and social services to victims of trafficking in the 8-state Midwest region; to increase awareness of human trafficking among communities; law enforcement and social service providers; and, to improve policies and practices so as to strengthen the protections for victims of trafficking.

Background

Human trafficking, often referred to as “modern day slavery,” is a multi-billion dollar criminal industry, the third most profitable illicit activity after illegal drugs and arms trafficking. It is considered a rapidly growing industry couched in the context of globalization and technological and scientific advancement (Florida State University, 2003). Evidence shows that the United States serves as a primary destination for victims of trafficking: the *2004 Trafficking in Persons Report* produced by the US State Department estimates that between 600,000 and 800,000 persons are trafficked across international borders each year, while between 14,500 and 17,500 persons are trafficked into the United States. (US Department of State, 2004). Drawn by false promises of safe and legal employment or study opportunities, trafficking victims are brought to the United States and forced into prostitution, agricultural work, sweatshop labor, and domestic servitude with little or no compensation. Traffickers keep victims virtually imprisoned through

coercive and abusive techniques including inflicting physical violence, committing sexual assault, threatening to harm victims' families, and threatening victims with deportation.

As the trafficking problem grew, Congress passed the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (VTVPA) of 2000 and the Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003, making it a federal crime to engage in human trafficking. These legal instruments constitute the US government's first organized attempts to combat human trafficking.

State governments have also taken measures to counter human trafficking in their communities. The Victims of Trafficking Reauthorization Act of 2003 endorses the passage of state-level trafficking laws, which promise to improve the efficacy of local law enforcement's response to human trafficking. Several states (Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, and Washington) have passed anti-trafficking bills, and similar legislation has been proposed in other states (Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, and New York). In 2005, Illinois amended its criminal code to include, "Trafficking of Persons and Involuntary Servitude," which criminalizes human trafficking and awards restitution to victims for unpaid wages. This type of legislation empowers state and local law enforcement agencies to prosecute cases of human trafficking. As more states work to pass legislation to make human trafficking a state crime, front-line law enforcement should likewise be prepared to identify and process victims of trafficking and to arrest and detain traffickers.

In most states, the federal anti-trafficking laws still remain the only legal remedies for victims of trafficking. Accordingly, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the Department of Labor (DOL), and the US Attorney's Offices remain primarily responsible for processing potential cases of human trafficking. The jurisdiction of trafficking cases at the federal level, however, may pose serious problems in successfully addressing trafficking issues in communities across the United States. For example, while the FBI may be able to process trafficking cases referred to the agency, it is ill-equipped to identify all cases in local communities. Because there are insufficient numbers of federal agents working to identify human trafficking cases at the local level, the task is more efficiently and effectively borne by members of local law enforcement who are able to work closely with local service providers to identify potential trafficking victims. Local police departments operate at the nexus of law enforcement, the criminal underworld, and the communities they serve. Furthermore, as first-responders to emergency situations, they are equipped to identify trafficking cases and make the crucial initial contact with traffickers and their victims. The 2004 report *Hidden Slaves: Forced Labor in the United States* argues that local law enforcement is the most crucial institution in identifying trafficking cases, but thus far, officers have not been adequately trained to do the job.

What follows is an in-depth exploration of the two components of this report: an assessment of the needs of victims of trafficking, of service providers, and law enforcement in the Midwest, and an evaluation of MIHRC's activities to meet these needs from January 2003 to December 2005.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to identify unmet needs of trafficking victims in the Midwest. Specifically, the Needs Assessment seeks to obtain a clearer understanding of where trafficking victims are likely to be found in the Midwest and the preparedness and needs of service providers and law enforcement to address human trafficking in the Midwest. This report includes a description of the following research projects conducted by MAIP:

1. A geographic data analysis using the 2000 Census and Office of Immigration Statistics (OIS) data on immigration to explore locations in the Midwest where human trafficking may take place. This component of the Needs Assessment builds on the work found in the *Hidden Slaves* report and the *Needs Assessment for Service Providers and Trafficking Victims* (Clawson, 2003)¹. These reports identified characteristics of individuals that can be viewed as risk factors for trafficking and characteristics of communities that may indicate that trafficking activities are present. MAIP used these characteristics to attempt to identify locations in the Midwest where victims may be.
2. A survey of service providers across the Midwest to obtain a clearer understanding of their preparedness for addressing human trafficking within their communities.
3. Interviews with local and federal law enforcement representatives across the Midwest to gain a broad understanding of the issues they encounter in addressing trafficking.
4. A survey of local law enforcement officers in a suburban Chicago community to obtain additional information about their experiences and understanding of human trafficking.

Geographic Data Analysis²

As part of our efforts to address human trafficking in the Midwest, MAIP analyzed US Census and OIS-DHS immigration data to surmise where in the Midwest victims of trafficking are likely to be found. To this end, MAIP analyzed several aspects of the foreign-born populations in the Midwest that may indicate locations where victims of human trafficking might reside. MAIP also examined the economic characteristics of the different states in the Midwest, as certain industries have been found to attract traffickers. Finally, MAIP analyzed immigration data to see where people with visas are entering the United States.

¹ Heartland Alliance participated in the 2003 Caliber Associates assessment.

² Data for recent immigrants, foreign-born populations, industry patterns, poverty, and English Language abilities were obtained from the US Census 2000 public use data files. (www.census.gov).

Foreign-born Populations³

There are over three million foreign-born persons living in the Midwest. Illinois has the largest foreign-born population of all Midwest states, with over 1.5 million persons, representing nearly half of all foreign-born persons residing in this region. Michigan has the next highest foreign-born population, with just over half a million residents. Iowa has the fewest, with a foreign-born population of fewer than 100,000 (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1
Midwest - Foreign-born numbers

State	Foreign born (Total)
Illinois	1,509,261
Indiana	182,751
Iowa	88,849
Michigan	514,695
Minnesota	254,250
Missouri	147,656
Ohio	333,271
Wisconsin	189,590



An analysis of the specific countries of origin for foreign-born persons reveals that the most common country of origin is Mexico (Table 1.2). This is true for all of the states except Ohio. Its largest group is its Indian population, followed closely by its Chinese, Mexican, Korean, and Eastern European populations. Illinois has the largest population of most nationalities; the vast majority of Latino (Mexican, Central American, and South American), Filipino, and Polish populations settle in Illinois. Still, there are certain groups that are more likely to settle in states other than Illinois. Both Wisconsin and Minnesota have larger Laotian and Thai populations than Illinois. Minnesota also has a considerable Vietnamese population. Also of interest is that Missouri's Bosnian population is nearly as large as Illinois' (Table 1.2).

³ We used Census 2000 to analyze the density of populations of people who are immigrants from counties where human trafficking activities may originate. These countries include most of Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Western Africa. Two important reports led to our inclusions of countries from these areas. The report *Needs Assessment for Service Providers and Trafficking Victims* summarized the characteristics of trafficking victims as described by service providers. The most common regions of origin described were Central America, South East Asia, Europe, and East Asia, although they did report victims coming from all over the world. Another report, *Hidden Slaves*, reported that in 2002 the most common country of origin for cases of forced labor in the United States were India, Vietnam, Mexico, and Indonesia, while in 2003 the most common were Honduras and Mexico.

Table 1.2:
Midwest - Foreign-Born numbers

	Poland	Russia	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yugoslavia	China	Korea	India	Pakistan	Cambodia
Illinois	139,710	16,366	10,109	15,301	50,705	40,681	83,916	19,616	2,891
Indiana	3,066	2,017	1,418	2,335	8,660	6,226	9,089	1,306	509
Iowa	511	1,391	5,695	448	4,132	4,302	3,779	456	623
Michigan	15,303	6,817	5,746	9,425	21,368	18,107	36,323	5,731	1,516
Minnesota	2,075	4,915	2,193	884	10,003	11,853	10,510	1,651	4,226
Missouri	1,372	2,719	7,106	1,318	9,514	5,506	7,578	1,599	692
Ohio	7,639	8,391	1,746	7,787	21,474	11,411	26,371	2,553	1,892
Wisconsin	4,534	2,954	927	3,241	7,137	6,075	7,832	1,337	358

	Laos	Philippines	Thailand	Vietnam	Western Africa	The Caribbean	Mexico	Other Central America	South America
Illinois	4,118	67,072	6,157	17,075	12,338	27,922	617,828	43,128	42,519
Indiana	817	5,501	1,092	4,078	2,277	3,601	62,113	6,342	5,401
Iowa	3,197	1,795	835	6,412	817	788	25,242	4,648	2,146
Michigan	4,791	13,679	3,064	10,869	6,171	11,298	58,392	8,348	10,666
Minnesota	25,968	4,518	8,738	15,727	8,676	3,361	41,592	6,851	10,752
Missouri	762	5,708	1,358	8,780	2,479	4,293	25,191	5,115	4,449
Ohio	2,770	9,914	2,370	8,710	6,825	9,458	20,551	7,086	10,029
Wisconsin	17,072	4,115	7,040	2,932	1,360	3,038	53,684	4,147	4,814

Basic Demographics

Immigration since 1990⁴

A large influx of ethnic groups into an area may indicate possible cases of human trafficking. Illinois has experienced the largest influx of immigrants since 1990, with the majority arriving from Mexico (Table 1.3). However, large numbers arrived from Asia and Europe as well. Michigan also experienced a large influx of persons from Asia. In fact, Asian immigrants represented the largest recently arrived immigrant group in all states except for Illinois and Indiana. Minnesota experienced the largest influx wave of immigrants from Africa.

⁴ Recent immigration was chosen as an indicator of human trafficking because it was assumed that areas experiencing a large influx of recent immigrants from countries previously identified as engaging in human trafficking to the United States would be more likely to have victims of trafficking. We used data from the Census 2000, which provides information on numbers of recent immigration (1990-2000) from Mexico and from regions like West Africa, Eastern Europe, and Southeast Asia.

Table 1.3
Midwest - Year of Entry to the US (Europe, Asia, Africa, & Latin America)

	Europe	Europe: 1990 to 2000	Asia	Asia: 1990 to 2000	Africa	Africa: 1990 to 2000	Mexico	Mexico: 1990 to 2000	Other Central America	Other Central America 1990 to 2000	South America	South America 1990 to 2000
Illinois	389,928	155,789	359,812	161,769	26,158	14,586	617,828	304,712	43,128	17,231	42,519	18,429
Indiana	43,305	14,039	49,613	26,491	7,308	4,831	62,113	40,198	6,342	3,897	5,401	3,193
Iowa	20,326	11,204	30,162	16,537	3,978	3,245	25,242	15,299	4,648	2,698	2,146	1,247
Michigan	156,988	51,868	209,416	109,734	16,735	10,007	58,392	36,011	8,348	4,960	10,666	5,149
Minnesota	43,652	19,292	105,153	48,601	34,469	27,436	41,592	28,978	6,851	4,371	10,752	6,560
Missouri	43,101	19,485	52,733	27,386	8,453	5,890	25,191	16,416	5,115	2,971	4,449	2,036
Ohio	131,683	36,254	120,213	60,928	22,034	15,100	20,551	12,824	7,086	3,649	10,029	4,763
Wisconsin	52,213	13,702	62,762	30,303	4,812	2,799	53,684	34,783	4,147	2,096	4,814	2,699

Languages⁵

According to Caliber and Free the Slaves, victims' lack of English proficiency makes them potentially less able to escape their traffickers. It also complicates efforts of law enforcement and service providers to outreach to communities where trafficking victims may be located. Persons who do not speak English therefore represent a potentially vulnerable group. Illinois has the largest population of adults and children who do not speak English (Table 1.4, 1.5). Most of these persons are Spanish-speaking. Michigan has the largest numbers of adults who do not speak English and speak "other" languages, while Minnesota has the largest population of children who speak "other" languages.⁶ Also, Minnesota has the most children who only speak Asian languages.

Table 1.4
Midwest - English Speaking Ability of Children (5-17) in the Midwest

State	Spanish: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Other Indo-European languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Asian and Pacific Island languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Other languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"
Illinois	55,233	5,827	3,461	7,896
Indiana	7,618	2,774	528	1,161
Iowa	4,104	1,056	518	1,266
Michigan	10,989	4,184	2,191	6,689
Minnesota	6,468	2,095	4,802	10,977
Missouri	5,538	2,269	637	1,547
Ohio	8,730	5,839	1,787	4,571
Wisconsin	8,436	2,793	2,589	5,387

⁵ In our report we used the Census 2000 to analyze language abilities. Unfortunately, the only specific languages for which the Census 2000 provides information are English and Spanish. For other languages, the Census groups them together by region.

⁶ Other languages are comprised mainly of African languages.

Table 1.5
Midwest - English Speaking Ability of Adults (18-64) in the Midwest

	Spanish: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Other Indo-European languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Asian and Pacific Island languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"	Other languages: Speak English "not well" or "not at all"
Illinois	310,759	70,589	31,465	5,485
Indiana	40,221	6,539	5,537	797
Iowa	17,849	4,491	4,423	631
Michigan	42,405	22,558	13,408	13,543
Minnesota	30,133	7,159	17,955	4,419
Missouri	19,752	8,088	6,655	985
Ohio	29,225	17,493	11,983	3,818
Wisconsin	34,096	6,649	8,745	634

Economic Characteristics

Industries

Both *Hidden Slaves* (2004) and Caliber's *Needs Assessment* (Clawson, et al., 2003) summarize the industries in which victims of trafficking are frequently forced to work. Although victims of trafficking work “under the radar,” and therefore are not directly reflected in official Census counts of persons working in industries, the *Hidden Slaves* report argues that the presence of these industries in an area probably indicates the presence of trafficking victims in those industries as well. Certainly, areas with many persons working in the agriculture industry could also have trafficking victims in said industry. Furthermore, there could also be women prostituted to the migrant farm workers in those areas, as exemplified by the 1996 Cadena trafficking case in Florida (Raymond & Hughes, 2001). The presence of other industries that have been associated with human trafficking could similarly signal the presence of other victims of trafficking working within them. For instance, Wisconsin has the largest agriculture industry in the Midwest (Table 1.6), which may indicate that there are trafficked persons being forced to work on farms there. Also, Illinois has the largest number of persons employed in the arts, entertainment, and recreation industries, which includes massage parlors and strip clubs, and therefore may include persons vulnerable to sex trafficking. Other vulnerable labor pools include manufacturing in Ohio and Michigan, and construction and accommodations and food service industries in Ohio and Illinois.

Table 1.6 ⁷

	Farming	Manufacturing	Construction	Accommodation & food services	Military	Arts, entertainment, and recreation
Illinois	94,461	771,927	383,022	431,463	51,614	135,056
Indiana	75,175	600,212	211,677	229,364	17,619	61,718
Iowa	106,808	233,827	102,798	110,794	12,188	32,518
Michigan	70,930	778,066	298,243	352,897	19,648	101,343
Minnesota	97,338	369,968	182,721	205,027	18,119	67,234
Missouri	121,141	304,734	193,915	205,923	31,759	59,114
Ohio	95,534	903,243	353,623	439,097	33,726	117,764
Wisconsin	98,328	543,350	180,231	226,291	15,656	58,257

Poverty Data

Areas high in poverty may also contain victims of trafficking. Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio all have similarly large numbers of people living in poverty (Table 1.7).

Table 1.7
Midwest – Poverty Numbers

	Number Living in Poverty
Illinois	1,291,958
Indiana	559,484
Iowa	258,008
Michigan	1,021,605
Minnesota	380,476
Missouri	637,891
Ohio	1,170,698
Wisconsin	451,538

*Ports of Entry and Manner of Entry Data*⁸

Many trafficked persons arrive in the United States with valid visas but stay beyond the allotted time. Traffickers often obtain visitor visas to smuggle their victims into the country. In other cases, traffickers may provide their victims with visas for temporary visitors who arrive to attend school in the United States, find temporary employment, or marry a US citizen. Data is available that breaks down where visitors to the US enter the country, the countries from which they arrive, and the types of visas they obtain.

⁷ Bureau of Economic Analysis. <http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/reis/drill.cfm>

⁸ Ports of Entry data were obtained from the Office of Immigration Statistics (OIS), Office of Management, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) 2002 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics (<http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/ybpage.htm>).

Being the largest tourist and business center in the Midwest, Chicago had the most international visitors in 2002 with most arriving on business and tourist visas. More visitors to Chicago come from Asia than Latin America (Table 1.9). Detroit, St. Paul, and Cincinnati also experienced a significant number of international visitors (Table 1.8). Nearly as many visitors from Asia arrive in Detroit as they do in Chicago.

Table 1.8
Midwest - Ports of Entry by Visa Types

Port of entry	State	Total Visitors	B1 Visas: Total Business Visitors	B2 Visas: Total Visitors for Pleasure	F1 Visas: Student Visas	H2A & H2B Visas: Work Visas	H3 Visas: Trainees	J1 Visas: Exchange Visas	K1 Visas: Fiancés of US Citizens
Alpena	MI	22	8	13	0	0	0	0	0
Chicago	IL	1,400,481	363,386	778,992	62,928	1,409	146	31,246	1,689
Cincinnati	OH	96,703	12	219	0	996	2	264	126
Cleveland	OH	8,054	1,508	5,469	182	11	3	124	10
Detroit	MI	546,432	126,882	269,628	35,757	398	79	12,107	1,443
Duluth	MN	72	23	43	1	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis	IN	614	184	274	6	3	0	5	1
Kansas City	MO	96	29	27	6	1	0	0	3
Milwaukee	WI	365	15	313	8	1	0	2	0
Minneapolis	MN	3,602	521	2,516	67	5	1	25	3
Port Huron	MI	16,794	2,991	8,455	743	325	0	171	58
Sault Ste. Marie	MI	3,814	351	2,338	256	129	0	18	17
St. Louis	MO	16,183	2,321	12,056	376	38	1	291	17
St. Paul	MN	178,843	36,933	102,527	12,563	432	20	4,087	477

Table 1.9
Midwest - Ports of Entry by Region of Origin

Port of entry	State	Total	Eastern Europe	Africa	Latin America	Asia
Algonac	MI	22	1	0	3	16
Chicago	IL	1,400,481	65,624	3,188	159,137	176,406
Cincinnati	OH	96,703	2,180	162	845	5,885
Cleveland	OH	8,054	42	46	121	453
Detroit	MI	546,432	11,877	2,123	15,937	126,476
Duluth	MN	72	1	0	0	11
Indianapolis	IN	614	45	0	98	11
Kansas City	MO	96	2	0	20	7
Milwaukee	WI	365	0	0	3	6
Minneapolis	MN	3,602	55	4	96	247
Port Huron	MI	16,794	805	14	540	1,571
Sault Ste. Marie	MI	3,814	34	0	88	102
St. Louis	MO	16,183	192	25	352	303
St. Paul	MN	178,843	3,816	712	1,156	30,106

Summary Findings of the Geographic Analysis

- Latin American and Asian trafficking victims are mostly likely to be located in the Chicagoland area. Victims of trafficking from Southeast Asia may be more likely to be found in Minnesota than in other states. Victims from Africa may also be more likely to be found in Minnesota.
- A large number of adult and children immigrants in Illinois speak little or no English, which could impact their ability to escape from traffickers if they are trafficking victims.
- Illinois has the largest number of persons employed in the arts, entertainment, and recreation industries, which includes massage parlors and strip clubs, and therefore may include persons vulnerable to sex trafficking. Other vulnerable labor pools include manufacturing in Ohio and Michigan, and construction and accommodations and food service industries in Ohio and Illinois.
- Among other Midwest ports of entry, Chicago experiences the highest volume of arriving immigrants and as such is more likely to be a point of entry for trafficking victims

Midwest Service Providers Survey

As has been previously discussed, service providers are key players in the fight against human trafficking. Not only are they important in helping victims recover from the ordeal, but they also may find themselves in a position to identify cases of trafficking in their communities. Therefore it is critical for service providers to be able to both identify and serve victims. To assess the needs of service providers, MIHRC surveyed service providers across the Midwest about their experiences and understanding of how to identify and serve victims of trafficking.

Surveys were distributed in two ways: 1) They were given prior to a training session held in St. Louis, and; 2) surveys were distributed through an e-mail sent to persons who had expressed interest in communicating with MIHRC about issues of trafficking in the Midwest. A total of 163 service providers completed the survey. Of these, 140 were completed at the training session and 23 were completed through e-mails. The analysis excludes the four persons working in law enforcement that completed the surveys because MAIP focuses specifically on the work of law enforcement in the following section.

Background Characteristics

Respondent Characteristics

The vast majority of those surveyed were female (96%) (Table 2.1). Their average age was 52 years, with a range from 17-82. On average, they reported being at their current job since 1997.

Table 2.1
Gender of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Female	156	95.7%
Male	3	4.3%
Total	159	

Organizational Characteristics

- Respondents reported working in a diverse group of fields including medical, mental health, religious, and education.
- As to the specific services that respondents indicated were provided by their organizations, the most commonly reported service was counseling (Table 2.2).

Table 2.2
What services does your agency provide?

Services Agencies Provide	Percent
Counseling	43.6%
Social/ Acculturative	17.2%
Vocational	12.3%
Translation	16.6%
Housing assistance	25.2%
Legal	11.0%
Language education	25.8%
Case management	30.1%
Job placement	17.2%
Advocacy	30.1%
Community education/outreach	36.2%
Medical	25.2%
Mental Health	25.2%
Victim services	22.1%

About half of respondents stated that their agency provided services in and around St. Louis, with the rest indicating that they provided services in Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin, internationally, and nationally.

The most common groups that respondents reported providing services to were Mexicans and Bosnians (Table 2.3). Interestingly, St. Louis has a particularly large Bosnian population. However, all major ethnic groups were represented among program participants of providers.

Table 2.3
 What cultural group(s) does your agency serve?

Cultures Served by Organizations	Percent
Mexican	48.5%
Puerto Rican	23.9%
Central American	31.9%
South American	30.1%
Indian	16.6%
Vietnamese	31.3%
Chinese	19.0%
Korean	16.6%
Filipino	18.4%
Ethiopian	21.5%
Albanian	14.1%
Yugoslavian	16.0%
Russian	19.0%
Polish	20.9%
Bulgarian	12.3%
Bosnian	35.6%
Czech	12.3%
Ukrainian	13.5%

The survey also asked providers to state which social problems were the most salient to their communities (Table 2.4). Poverty, education, and access to affordable health care were the most frequently cited social problems. This information is important because it allows us to better understand what people view as the most important issues to address, and to locate victims of trafficking with the larger context of community social problems. In this case, 21.5% of providers identified human trafficking as a social problem in their communities.

Table 2.4

What are some salient social issues facing the communities you serve?

Social Problem	Percentage
Poverty	69.3%
Education	66.3%
Health care	65.6%
Domestic violence	54.0%
Affordable housing	56.4%
Employment	58.9%
Undocumented legal issues	38.7%
Sexual assault	34.4%
Crime	46.0%
Racial conflicts	42.3%
Discrimination	38.0%
Forced labor	11.7%
Human trafficking	21.5%
Drugs	47.9%
Gangs	25.8%
Labor code violations	18.4%

Survey Results

When asked the scope of human trafficking in the communities they work, most reported not knowing enough to determine the severity of the trafficking problem (Table 2.5).

Table 2.5

In your community, how much of a problem is...

	Not a Problem	2	3	4	Severe Problem	Don't Know	Missing
human trafficking?	6.1%	9.8%	7.4%	6.7%	3.7%	62.6%	3.7%
forced prostitution?	4.9%	12.3%	4.9%	8.6%	4.3%	61.3%	3.7%
forced labor?	5.5%	11.0%	6.7%	4.3%	4.9%	63.8%	3.7%
domestic servitude?	3.7%	12.3%	7.4%	4.9%	3.1%	64.4%	4.3%
indentured servitude?	6.7%	7.4%	4.3%	3.1%	1.2%	73.0%	4.3%
trafficking in children?	6.7%	8.6%	3.7%	3.7%	2.5%	69.9%	4.9%

The majority answered that they had no knowledge of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Table 2.6).

Table 2.6

Are you familiar with the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000?

	Frequency	Percent
No	112	68.7%
Yes	48	29.4%
Missing	3	1.8%

Most reported that they did not know much about how to identify or provide services to victims of human trafficking (2.7).

Table 2.7

On a scale from 1 to 10 with 10 being expert knowledge, how well do you rate your knowledge of how...

	n	Mean	SD
to identify cases of human trafficking?	152	2.6	2.07
to provide services to victims of human trafficking?	152	2.8	2.29

Generally, service providers were interested in receiving additional training on issues related to victims of trafficking (2.8). They were the most interested in learning more about how to identify and provide services to victims of trafficking, but most were still interested in learning more about relevant state and federal human trafficking laws. Less than one-third of respondents were familiar with local efforts to combat human trafficking.

Table 2.8

Interest in additional training

	n	Yes	No	Percent
Would you like to receive training on the VTVPA?	141	97	44	68.8%
If applicable to your agency, would you like to receive training on state trafficking laws?	107	62	45	57.9%
Would you like to receive training on how to identify cases of trafficking?	145	120	25	82.8%
Would you like to receive training on how to provide services to victims of trafficking?	143	116	27	81.1%
Are you familiar with the rescue and restore campaign or other local efforts to combat human trafficking in your community?	149	45	104	30.2%

Summary Findings of Midwest Service Provider Survey

- Service providers generally did not feel prepared to effectively combat human trafficking in their communities. Most reported not knowing enough about human trafficking to determine if it is a real problem in their communities. Most also did not feel that they could identify cases of human trafficking in their communities, provide appropriate services to victims once they are discovered, and were not familiar with anti-trafficking laws (68%).
- Just over 20% of service providers identified human trafficking as a serious social problem in the communities where they work.
- Most service providers reported that they would like to learn more about how to identify cases of human trafficking (83%), how to provide victims with services (81%), and about relevant anti-trafficking laws (69%).
- Very few service providers were aware of local efforts to combat human trafficking in their communities (30%).

Law Enforcement Needs Assessment

Through interviews with key informants across the Midwest and surveys with front line law enforcement in one suburban Chicago community, the assessment aimed to gain a clearer understanding of the needs of law enforcement agencies in the Midwest to help them adequately identify and process victims of trafficking and to prosecute the traffickers. With these goals in mind, MAIP asked law enforcement officials about their experiences with victims of trafficking, their ability to identify and process victims of trafficking cases, barriers that prevent them from identifying and processing potential trafficking cases, their needs for improving their abilities to identify and process cases, and their opinions and beliefs about trafficking cases.

Currently in all but two Midwest states (Illinois and Minnesota) there are no state laws criminalizing human trafficking. As such, in Iowa, Missouri, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the Department of Labor (DOL), and the US Attorney's Office are the law enforcement bodies mainly responsible for processing cases of human trafficking. The jurisdiction of trafficking cases at the federal level may pose serious problems in successfully addressing trafficking issues in communities across the Midwest. While federal agencies may be able to process trafficking cases that are referred to them, they are not equipped to identify all cases of human trafficking at the local community level. In addition, the task of coordinating prosecution efforts between local and federal law enforcement offices has been difficult at best. There is often a degree of confusion as to which agency has jurisdiction over trafficking cases.

Since Illinois and Minnesota both have state anti-trafficking laws, local law enforcement is granted more powers to prosecute traffickers. However, with the greater powers to handle cases of human trafficking comes a greater need to ensure that local law enforcement is prepared to

address human trafficking. Unfortunately, as Free the Slaves (2004) argues in its report, local law enforcement has not been adequately trained to do the job.

These gaps in the capabilities of law enforcement in the Midwest lead us to systematically address these gaps through interviews with key informants across the Midwest and through the implementation of a survey in a suburban community.

Interviews with Law Enforcement

Potential interviewees were identified through MIHRC law enforcement contacts. MAIP sent letters of inquiry asking if they would be interested in being interviewed on issues of human trafficking. Participants were not offered compensation. Ten interviewees responded to the letter. All interviewees went through an informed consent process. A summary of the ten interviews is included in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
Completed Interviews with Law Enforcement Persons in the Midwest

Title	Agency	Location
Victim Specialist	FBI	Kansas City, MO
Special Agent	FBI	Milwaukee, WI
Victim Witness Coordinator	ICE/RAC (Resident Agent-in-Charge)	Strafford, MO
Victim Specialist	FBI	St. Louis, MO
Commander	Aurora Police Dept.	Aurora, IL
Victim Witness Specialist	FBI	Indianapolis, IN
Special Agent	FBI	Chicago, IL
Lieutenant	Detroit Police Department	Detroit, MI
Detective	Columbus Police Dept.	Columbus, OH
LECC	US Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Wisconsin	Milwaukee, WI

Summary Findings of Interviews

Although eight respondents reported attending structured trainings on the issue of human trafficking, only five reported having knowledge of the VTVPA of 2000, and only two reported having knowledge about the Reauthorization Act of 2003.

Five respondents reported that they knew of human trafficking cases that their office processed. Of the five, two reported cases originating in the Philippines, two reported cases from other areas in the United States (state-to-state), two reported cases from Mexico, one from China, one from India, one from Ghana, and one from Korea.

Three reported that the victims of trafficking they handled were forced domestic servants. Two reported cases of forced prostitution. One was forced to work as a landscaper, and another was forced to work at a dry cleaning shop.

The most frequently identified barrier to law enforcement adequately addressing human trafficking was the reluctance of victims to come forward due to fear of retribution or distrust of law enforcement (Table 3.2). Three respondents mentioned a lack of cooperation with other agencies, which includes law enforcement agencies. However, the statement may convey their belief that social service agencies, in an effort to protect their clients, do not fully cooperate with the police.

Table 3.2
Identified Barriers to Processing Cases

	Frequency
Language and cultural barriers	6
Victims unwilling to come forward due to fear of traffickers and of law enforcement	8
Lack of training by law enforcement	2
Lack of cooperation/coordination with other agencies	3

Survey of Law Enforcement in one Chicagoland Community

As the second component of the efforts to explore the needs of law enforcement agencies in the Midwest, MAIP administered a survey to local law enforcement in one suburban Chicago community.

In 2000, the census measured the city's population at 142,990, making it the second-largest city in Illinois. The city has experienced dramatic growth over the last two decades, and is among the fastest growing cities in the United States. As of October 31st, 2003, the city's Police Department had a total of 356 law enforcement employees. Sworn officers working full-time total 274 (27 females and 247 males) and 82 civilian officers who work full-time (60 females and 22 males). The department delivers police services in an area encompassing over 40 square miles that spans four counties. To date, there are no documented cases of human trafficking in this city.

One law enforcement officer interviewed for the Needs Assessment expressed an interest and agreed to distribute surveys to their front line officers. He also provided MAIP with feedback on the survey questions and informed consent document and process. MAIP provided him with copies of the revised survey and informed consent forms, along with return postage. The surveys were distributed to police officers during roll call and returned through regular US mail. Surveys responses were anonymous, and the survey data were entered and analyzed using the statistics data package SPSS 12.0.

Seventy-one police officers took the surveys. Sixty-three respondents were men and eight were women. The average age of survey respondents was 38.5 years, ranging from 21 to 56 years. Respondents on average had 15 years of law enforcement experience, and the range for this sample varied from half a year to 32 years. Ten were sergeants, five were investigators or detectives, and 55 were patrol officers.

Survey of Local Law Enforcement Results

Experiences with Human Trafficking Cases

Although nearly half of survey respondents felt that human trafficking was at least somewhat common in their communities (Table 3.3), none of the survey respondents reported ever uncovering a human trafficking case in their communities.

Table 3.3:
How common is human trafficking in your community (where you work)?

	Percent
not at all	22.8%
2	29.8%
somewhat	36.8%
4	7.0%
very	3.5%

The Ability to Identify and Process Victims of Trafficking Cases

Local law enforcement generally reported feeling ill-prepared to address human trafficking in their communities. None of the survey respondents reported ever receiving any training on human trafficking. As a result most did not feel knowledgeable about relevant anti-trafficking laws (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4
Knowledge of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (VTVPA) of 2000?

	Percent
no knowledge at all	70.4%
2	12.7%
some knowledge	5.6%
3	0%
expert knowledge	1.4%

Most did not feel that other agents were knowledgeable about the law either. They also indicate their belief that the police and the courts do not execute laws against human trafficking well (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5
Preparedness of criminal justice system to address trafficking.

	not at all	2	Some-what	4	very
How well is the law executed by police?	55.4%	21.4%	8.9%	10.7%	3.6%
How well is law executed by the courts?	43.8%	33.3%	20.8%	0.0%	2.1%
How well educated are other officers about law?	65.0%	21.7%	5.0%	6.7%	1.7%

The vast majority of respondents (83%) expressed an interest in learning about anti-trafficking laws like the VTVPA.

Perceived Needs and Barriers to Identify and Process Trafficking Cases

The barriers identified by respondents were generally consistent with those mentioned in MAIP's interviews with law enforcement:

- 27% identified victims being uncooperative/ fear of victims as a barrier.
- 23% identified lack of training and/or information.
- 18% identified jurisdiction/ cooperation with outside agencies as barriers.
- 13% identified language and culture barriers.
- 8% identified lack of resources, such as money, time, personnel, as potential barriers.
- 52% identified a need for more training and information.
- 17% identified a need for clarification regarding jurisdiction issues.
- 17% identified a need for more resources (personnel, time, money, a 1-800 hotline).
- 4% identified a need for more access to the communities where trafficking may be occurring.

Attitudes and Beliefs about Victims of Trafficking

To uncover local police's attitudes and beliefs of victims of trafficking as compared to victims of other human rights violations, MAIP divided respondents into two groups that read rather similar vignettes, with one important distinction. One vignette described a bona fide human trafficking case, while the other was a case of labor code violations. They were then asked to rate how responsible the persons were for their respective situations and to determine what kind of case the scenario depicted.

Interestingly, the level of responsibility assigned by police to the victim in each scenario did not differ. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 indicating more personal responsibility, each group assigned the person's responsibility a 2.7. This indicates that the police felt that the victims of trafficking were just as responsible for their predicament as was the character in the labor code violations scenario.

After reading case examples of trafficking and non-trafficking, as defined by US laws, they were asked to "fill in the blank" and identify the case type. For the trafficking case example, only four respondents used the term "human trafficking" to describe the scenario, which demonstrates that respondents, on the whole, did not recognize the case as such (Table 3.6). Most viewed it as a case of labor law and/or immigration violations.

Table 3.6:
Law Enforcement Responses of Crimes Committed – Trafficking Case

Response	Frequency
Slavery/slave labor	6
Human trafficking or trafficking	4
Labor law violations: unfair labor/forced labor/IL Dept. of Labor (violations), OSHA violations, minimum wage violations, sweat factory, illegal labor practices, unfair labor practices	17
Immigration/illegal immigration/US Immigration Naturalization Dept./INS	9
Unlawful restraint	2
Intimidation	2
Building code violations, fire code	2
Extortion	3
Other: social security fraud, kidnapping, abuse, neglect, unknown	5

Summary Findings of Law Enforcement Interviews and Surveys

- Law enforcement providers generally did not feel prepared to effectively combat human trafficking in their communities.
- Although a few federal law enforcement officials reported that they had attended trainings in human trafficking, no local law enforcement reported attending any type of training.
- Very few local law enforcement (19%) reported having any knowledge of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (VTVPA) of 2000.
- Most local law enforcement did not feel that human trafficking cases were executed well by the police (77%) or the courts (77%).
- The vast majority of local law enforcement (83%) reported being interested in learning about anti-trafficking laws like the VTVPA.
- Local law enforcement identified several barriers to addressing human trafficking cases including:
 - uncooperative/ fearful victims
 - a lack of training and/or information
 - lack of clarity of jurisdiction/ lack of cooperation with outside agencies
 - language and culture differences
 - lack of resources, money, time, and personnel.

Needs Assessment Conclusions and Recommendations

- Census and OIS data on the prevalence and diversity of the Midwest's immigrant population and its economic characteristics suggests that this region of the United States may be susceptible to human trafficking.
- More training opportunities on human trafficking should be offered to service providers and law enforcement agencies across the Midwest. Most law enforcement and service providers expressed a strong need and desire for additional trainings and information.
- Trainings should focus on helping service providers and law enforcement identify possible cases of human trafficking, how best to provide services to victims, and how to legally process cases once they are discovered.
- Trainings should be conducted with both law enforcement and service providers in attendance. Doing so could help improve cooperation, communication, and trust between these groups. Both service providers and law enforcement need to work more closely together to improve counter-trafficking efforts.
- Trainings that combine local and federal law enforcement are recommended to clarify roles and jurisdiction.
- Local trafficking prevention and response initiatives should do more outreach to service provider organizations. Local initiatives need to engage a broad range and number of service providers in addressing human trafficking.

INTERIM PROGRAM EVALUATION

Impact Overview

This interim evaluation of Heartland Alliance's Midwest Immigrant & Human Rights Center (MIHRC), in Chicago, Illinois covers activities undertaken from January 2003 through December 2005.

MIHRC has completed its third year serving as the primary legal and social service provider/coordinator for potential victims of trafficking in the Midwest and as the information and training resource for human trafficking related issues in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin. This report evaluates the efforts of MIHRC in light of its stated goals: to provide legal and social services to victims of trafficking in the 8-state Midwest region; to increase awareness of human trafficking among communities; law enforcement, and social service providers; and, to improve policies and practices so as to strengthen the protections for victims of trafficking.

To achieve these goals, MIHRC:

- Provided legal services to potential victims of trafficking;
- Provided victims of trafficking with victim-based support services;
- Engaged in outreach efforts to improve public awareness of the problem of human trafficking and to improve the efficacy of service providers and law enforcement in addressing human trafficking in their communities;
- Developed materials and conducted trainings for legal and social service providers, local and federal law enforcement, and employers;
- Engaged in education activities to inform organizations in Illinois and other states about how state laws against human trafficking might impact their efforts to address human trafficking;
- Provided technical assistance to organizations, agencies, and coalitions working to implement the VTVPA.

MAIP also analyzed the characteristics of trafficking victims that have been served in the Midwest by MIHRC. From 2003-2005, MIHRC provided services to 64 potential victims of trafficking and screened thousands of individuals for cases of trafficking through its regular client intake process. Although not all the 64 potential victims have qualified for T-Visas, MIHRC has been able to provide most with some legal protections. Also, MIHRC has participated in 232 community trainings and presentations. In these events, 8000 persons including persons from non-profit, for-profit, and government agencies have attended. Finally, MIHRC played a vital role in providing technical assistance and education to organizations and agencies within the 8-state region.

MIHRC Client Data Analysis

The evaluation of Heartland Alliance’s Counter-Trafficking Program analyzes the characteristics of victims who have been served since January 2003 and compares the results to trends anticipated by the Needs Assessment. This analysis identifies client demographics (country-of-origin, their gender, age, language abilities), information on how they were trafficked into the United States, and the work they were forced to do when they arrived.

MIHRC Client Demographics

MIHRC Clients - Country of Origin

Given that Mexicans are the largest foreign-born group in the Midwest, it is not a surprise that they make up the majority of MIHRC’s 64 clients (Table 4.1). However, it is important to consider that MIHRC’s clients represent a diverse group of immigrants, with significant numbers coming from Africa, Asia, and Eastern Europe as well.

Table 4.1

Country of Origin	Frequency	Percent	Country of Origin	Frequency	Percent
Eastern Europe	12	18.8%	Asia	16	25.0%
Albania	2	3.1%	Bangladesh	2	3.1%
Bulgaria	1	1.6%	China	4	6.3%
Czech Republic	1	1.6%	India	3	4.7%
Latvia	1	1.6%	Korea	3	4.7%
Macedonia	1	1.6%	Pakistan	1	1.6%
Romania	1	1.6%	Philippines	3	4.7%
Russia/Russian Federation	1	1.6%			
Ukraine	4	6.3%			
Latin America	21	32.8%	Africa	15	23.4%
Argentina	2	3.1%	Cameroon	1	1.6%
Columbia	2	3.1%	Ethiopia	5	7.8%
Dominican Republic	1	1.6%	Ghana	4	6.3%
El Salvador	1	1.6%	Ivory Coast	1	1.6%
Guatemala	2	3.1%	Malawi	1	1.6%
Honduras	5	7.8%	Mauritania	1	1.6%
Mexico	7	10.9%	Nigeria	1	1.6%
Paraguay	1	1.6%	Somalia	1	1.6%

MIHRC Clients - Age and Gender

Women and children are especially at risk for being trafficked. Consistent with this finding are data showing that women make up the vast majority of MIHRC’s clients (78.9%), and over 40% were children when they arrived in the United States. (Table 4.2, Table 4.3).

Table 4.2

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	52	81.3%
Male	12	18.8%
Total	64	

Table 4.3

Age at Time of Entry to the United States	Frequency	Percent
7-12 years	5	7.8%
13-18 years	22	34.4%
19-24 years	11	17.2%
25-30 years	6	9.4%
31-40 years	4	6.3%
41-60 years	7	10.9%
Missing data	9	14.1%

MIHRC Clients - Language Abilities

It has been noted that persons who do not speak English may be less able to escape their captors. Indeed, a large number of MIHRC clients were not able to speak English at the time MIHRC began working with them (Table 4.4). Although it is noteworthy that a significant percentage of MIHRC clients did speak English (26.3%), which demonstrates that even immigrants with excellent or good English-speaking abilities could still be at risk for trafficking. Table 4.5 summarizes the primary languages spoken by clients.

Table 4.4

English Proficiency	Frequency	Percent
None	28	43.8%
Not well	12	18.8%
Well	10	15.6%
Very well	12	18.8%
Missing data	2	3.3%

Table 4.5

Language(s) Spoken	Frequency	Percent
Albanian	1	1.6%
Amharic	1	1.6%
Arabic	1	1.6%
Bengali	1	1.6%
Bulgarian/Russian/English	1	1.6%
Chinese (Fuzhounese)	1	1.6%
Chinese (Mandarin)	3	4.7%
Czech/English	1	1.6%
English	16	25%
Italian/English	1	1.6%
French	1	1.6%
Korean	3	4.7%
Latvian/Russian	1	1.6%
Macedonian	1	1.6%
Romanian	1	1.6%
Russian	5	7.8%
Spanish	20	31.3%
Spanish/Quiche	1	1.6%
Tigrinya	1	1.6%
Urdu	1	1.6%

MIHRC Client Trafficking Process

MIHRC Clients – Place of Entry to US

The greatest number of clients served by MIHRC arrived in the United States through Chicago, followed by New York and the Texas border (Table 4.6). The variety of different ports of entry reveals that victims do not permanently settle upon arrival; in fact they may continue to relocate, whether forced or by their own volition, after their migration to the United States.

Table 4.6

Place of Entry	Frequency	Percent
Arizona	3	4.7%
California	2	3.1%
Chicago, IL	14	21.9%
Florida	3	4.7%
Mexican border	2	3.1%
New York, NY	13	20.3%
Newark, NJ	1	1.6%
Texas	13	20.3%
Washington	1	1.6%
Washington, DC	4	6.3%
Missing data	8	12.5%

MIHRC Clients – Manner of Entry

A large proportion (40%) of MIHRC clients entered the United States in already vulnerable immigrant situations, most commonly through “Entry Without Inspection” (Table 4.7). This method usually entails crossing into states that border Mexico. The remaining clients entered on temporary visas, many of which were dependent on institutions or individuals for continuation of status.

Table 4.7

	Frequency	Percent
Visitor visas	20	31.3%
Employment visas	4	6.3%
Entry Without Inspection	21	32.8%
False documents	6	9.4%
Lawful permanent resident	2	3.1%
Marriage visas	4	6.3%
Student visas	3	4.7%
Missing data	4	6.3%

MIHRC Clients - Forced Occupations

Most MIHRC clients were victims of sex trafficking, followed by trafficking for labor (Table 4.8). Domestic servitude was the third most prevalent form of forced labor.

Table 4.8

Industry Type	Frequency	Percent
Domestic servitude	9	14%
Labor-other	20	31%
Labor & sex	10	16%
Sale of children	2	3%
Sex	18	28%
Trafficked outside US	5	8%

MIHRC Clients - Time Lapsed Between Date of Arrival to the US and Date of Intake

At one extreme, a client was in the country for two days prior to intake, while another client spent approximately 18 years and 9 months in the United States before becoming a client of MIHRC. Overall, most clients had been in the United States for less than one year before MIHRC began providing services to them (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9

Time lapsed	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 month	9	14.1%
31 days to 6 months	10	15.6%
181 days to 1 year	12	18.8%
1 to 2 years	4	6.3%
2 to 5 years	11	17.2%
5 to 19 years	10	15.6%
Missing data	8	12.5%

Case Management and Social Services

The primary goal of the Heartland Alliance’s Counter-Trafficking Services project is to protect trafficking victims by providing emergency services, comprehensive legal assistance, healthcare and social services leading to full integration into society. Heartland’s social services component first ensured trafficking victims’ safety and provided emergency services, coordinated other social services on the basis of a needs assessment conducted within one week of contact, and provided client-based advocacy to assure access to all government services and benefits for which clients were eligible.

Heartland served trafficking victims by providing temporary housing, mental health services, medical services, employment, ESL education, family reunification, transportation, translation, and food assistance. The social service team worked in conjunction with the legal team to ensure a continuum of care and to address unique social service needs that emerged in the course of legal services. To meet these needs, MIHRC has and continues to develop a network of service providers across the Midwest that currently numbers 28 partnering service organizations.

Of the 64 clients served by MIHRC, 63 (98%) were provided social services. Clients that did receive services received an average of 5.9 different services, demonstrating that clients typically received multiple services to fit their needs. The most common form of social service provided to clients was victim services (Table 5.1), which denotes assessment, case management or service coordination, including facilitating engagement with law enforcement⁹. Although not tracked by hour, case management services were time intensive requiring a great deal of accompaniment and support for victims. While Heartland’s model endeavored to empower victims, significant support was offered as victims built confidence and capacity. Housing was the second most common service provided and includes responses from emergency shelter at area hotels as well as lodging in private homes, temporary accommodation in one of two apartments that Heartland Alliance leased specifically for trafficking victims, and referrals to domestic violence shelters or to transitional housing programs after stabilization. The third most common services were communications assistance, from office phones or in the form of phone cards, and transportation in the form of public transportation passes or accompaniment in taxis to appointments, for

⁹ Child victims of human trafficking referred to Heartland’s International Children’s Center are not included in this figure.

example. Emergency medical and basic screenings were provided to 54.7% of clients, most often through Heartland programs such as the International Children’s Center (ICC) and Heartland Health Outreach. Psychological and mental health screenings and services were provided as necessary and as requested by the client, at times to support the legal case by demonstrating that the client was a victim of a severe form of human trafficking or to treat post-traumatic stress disorder, for example. Basic dental care was similarly provided through Heartland’s ICC and Spang Center for Oral Health. All clients in need of interpretation services were assisted through MIHRC’s extensive network of volunteers and through Heartland’s Cross-Cultural Interpreting Services. Referrals for education and employment assistance facilitated greater self-sufficiency for trafficking victims as they integrate into new communities.

Table 5.1
Social Services Provided to Clients

Service	Clients	%
Assistance Obtaining Benefits	27	42.2%
Communications	35	54.7%
Dental	12	18.8%
Education (other than ESL)	30	46.8%
Employment	22	34.4%
Food	32	50%
Housing	38	59.4%
Interpretation	33	51.6%
Legal Referral ¹⁰	14	21.9%
Medical	35	54.7%
Psych/ Mental Health	26	40.6%
Transportation	35	54.7%
Victim Services	46	71.9%

Legal Services

The goal of providing legal services to trafficking victims is to obtain the relief the client seeks: either safe repatriation or obtaining immigration protections in the United States. Legal services are critical to ensuring that trafficking victims obtain protection, are not penalized for crimes they were forced to commit, and can seek livelihoods free from violence and abuse. Legal services also include advocating for individuals and their rights as victim witnesses in the criminal justice process. As a legal service provider, MIHRC plays an important role in meeting the legal needs of trafficking victims in the Midwest. As demonstrated by the client data analyses, the majority of MIHRC clients enter the United States either with a valid visa or without documentation. If trafficking victims are not immediately identified as such, they risk being deported and therefore further victimized due to their undocumented status or visa overstay. MIHRC worked with 64 clients through December 2005. Of these, only five clients were not at risk of immediate removal when first referred to MIHRC.

¹⁰ MIHRC makes legal referrals for civil matters not related to immigration such as divorce.

The most obvious method of protecting a victim of trafficking is to provide them with Continued Presence and/or a T-Visa, protections which were specifically created in the VTVPA of 2000 and which result in many of the same benefits that refugee status provides. To qualify for these protections, a victim must be willing to cooperate with law enforcement in the investigation and/or prosecution of the traffickers.

MIHRC has been very successful in obtaining appropriate immigration relief for its trafficking victim clients. MIHRC has secured Continued Presence, T or U Visa relief for 40% of trafficking victims served with an additional 25% still pending relief. The granting of Continued Presence strengthens the T-Visa application and also provides victims with more stability to assist in the prosecution of the trafficker(s). In addition, through December 2005, 18 MIHRC clients were certified as victims of human trafficking including three minors who had not received Continued Presence or a T-Visa.

Human trafficking cases are complex and require significant time and dedication. The way the VTVPA is written, the immigration legal case and the prosecution case overlap as victims must cooperate with law enforcement in order to proceed with the application for Continued Presence and/or a T or U-Visa. MIHRC seeks not only legal relief for the victim but also supports victim response to law enforcement in prosecuting traffickers without compromising the attorney/client relationship. It is not uncommon for legal services to extend for years before a case is fully resolved. Since January 2003, the following remedies were obtained on behalf of MIHRC clients (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2

	Frequency	Percent
Continued Presence	14	22%
T Visa	5	8%
T Visa for children of trafficking victims	2	NA
U Visa	6	10%
Other Relief: Asylum	4	6%
Other Relief: Special Immigrant Juvenile Visa	1	2%
Pending Relief	16	25%
Ordered removed	3	5%
Voluntary departure	1	2%
Voluntary repatriation	5	8%
Relocated before services completed	5	8%
Withdrawal before services completed	3	5%

Community Outreach and Training

A hugely successful component of MIHRC’s anti-trafficking activities has been its community outreach and training efforts. These efforts have focused on the groups identified in the Needs Assessment that would benefit from additional information and training, including social service providers and law enforcement. So far, MIHRC has participated in over 230 trainings and presentations across the Midwest (Table 6.1) designed to improve people’s understanding of anti-trafficking laws, their abilities to identify victims of trafficking, and the steps to take after identifying a trafficking case. Also, by providing so many training opportunities across the Midwest, MIHRC has greatly increased its visibility as an anti-trafficking resource for victims, law enforcement, and service providers.

Table 6.1
Community Outreach Events

	Trainings/ Presentations	Participants
Chicagoland Area	181	5144
Regional	51	2856
Total	232	8000

As would be expected based on the information learned in the needs assessment, the majority of outreach efforts took place in the Chicago area (Table 6.2). These efforts involved a large number of both service providers and law enforcement (Table 6.3).

Table 6.2
Chicagoland – Community Outreach Events

	Trainings/ Presentations	Participants
Law Enforcement/Legal	64	1770
Service providers/ Faith-based groups	82	1944
Community Agency/Area Businesses Meetings	12	404
Multi-Agency Trainings/ Presentations	23	1026
Total	181	5144

Over 200 attorneys and over 1500 law enforcement personnel in the Chicagoland area received training on human trafficking issues (Table 6.3). Among the law enforcement in the Chicagoland area, local and state officers comprised the majority of participants, but a significant number from federal agencies were also trained.

Table 6.3
Chicagoland – Law Enforcement/ Legal Outreach Events

	Trainings/ Presentations	Participants
Pro Bono Attorneys/ Law Students	10	222
Local/State/Federal Law Enforcement	40	1548

MIHRC also provided trainings to service providers in every state in the Midwest (Table 6.4). A total of 51 trainings and presentations were held with a regional focus on trafficking, with 2856 persons attending. Again these trainings included service providers, law enforcement agencies, business leaders, and other persons interested in combating human trafficking in their communities.

Table 6.4
Regional Events

	Trainings/ Presentations	Participants
IL	11	792
IN	4	203
IA	3	135
MI	11	380
MN	4	370
MO	4	272
OH	3	256
WI	5	99
Regional	6	349
Total	51	2856

In addition, MIHRC trainings attracted individuals from different professional fields concerned with human trafficking. Although social service providers were the most represented, the attendees included medical professionals and even ICE detainees (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5
Regional Events – Community Outreach Events

Group	Attendance
ICE Detainees	58
Faith-based Organizations	60
Medical Professionals	57
Social Service Providers	654
Legal Providers and Local, State, and Federal LEA	693
Multi Agency (other)	1334
Total	2856

Midwest Network Against Trafficking & Slavery

In 2003, Heartland created the Midwest Network Against Trafficking & Slavery (MNATS), a network of social service, law enforcement, and legal providers interested in expanding the discussion and awareness of human trafficking. The MNATS newsletter served as a vehicle to maintain connections among network members and provided information to individuals, legal and social service organizations, governmental agencies, and policymakers regarding emerging issues. To ensure continued engagement on the issue of trafficking to trained and interested service providers and law enforcement, MIHRC distributed the MNATS newsletter quarterly. The newsletter reported on human trafficking resources, changes in policy, ways to help identify victims, updates on Heartland program activities and trainings, and new developments in the field. By December 2005, MNATS had grown to 779 members. This strong base will serve as the foundation for the new state coalitions and Bureau of Justice Assistance initiatives now in formation that will continue the work of MNATS.

Changes in Policy and Practice

MIHRC's influence on changes in policy and practice result principally from its extensive training and outreach activities. MIHRC has developed and distributed educational materials to various government entities across the Midwest informing them about human trafficking law, relevant agency guidance, and Heartland services including training opportunities. These entities included: state refugee coordinators, FBI, ICE offices, Victim Witness Coordinators, Department of Labor offices, and Department of Health & Human Services offices.

MIHRC's educational efforts contributed significantly to the passage of state law in Illinois that became effective on January 1, 2006 criminalizing human trafficking and providing for asset forfeiture and mandatory restitution for victims. Because of MIHRC's efforts to increase public awareness on trafficking issues, Illinois policy makers have become aware of the need to provide protection for victims of human trafficking. Steps have been taken to ensure that services are available for victims and that the traffickers are prosecuted. Heartland is working with the Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS), the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Public Health and other state agencies to educate them on trafficking, provide technical assistance, and assist, as requested, on revising policies that will help to enhance screening and identification of potential victims in the various state systems. Specifically, MIHRC has worked with IDHS to improve the distribution of benefits to trafficking victims.

Illinois is serving as a model for other states. Lawmakers in Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan and Ohio have requested information from MIHRC in order to improve their laws and policies ensuring the protection of trafficking victims. Importantly, law enforcement agencies that participated in MIHRC trainings were successful in their applications to create Bureau of Justice Assistance Task Forces against human trafficking resulting in four new Midwest coalitions.

MIHRC has shared the expertise it has developed over the past few years on the delivery of services to victims of human trafficking to other coalitions, networks and law enforcement

agencies throughout the country. MIHRC continues to meet with the US Attorney's Office, ICE and the FBI to discuss ways to obtain Continued Presence when investigations are initiated by local law enforcement. MIHRC has seen successful federal responses to trafficking cases resulting in swift Continued Presence requests, victim certification and access to benefits. After attending MIHRC trainings, ICE, FBI and Victim Witness Coordinators in Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin understand the value of Continued Presence for the victim and have worked with victims and their lawyers in obtaining Continued Presence while prosecuting traffickers. Continued Presence has ensured that victims obtain the necessary protections in order for the prosecution of the traffickers to proceed.

Summary of MIHRC's Interim Activities

MIHRC has provided services to 64 victims, and has provided training and education to 8000 key professionals in the Midwest.

The backgrounds characteristics of MIHRC clients are consistent with those that have been described in previous studies of human trafficking.

- While the largest group of clients originated from Latin America (33%), the population served reflects the diversity of the larger immigrant population in the Midwest.
- Most clients were women (81%).
- A large number were children (42%).
- Nearly two-thirds of clients did not speak English well (63%). A significant percentage of MIHRC clients did speak English (26.3%), which demonstrates that even immigrants with excellent or good English-speaking abilities could still be at risk for trafficking.
- Most entered the United States through Chicago, New York, or points of entry along the US-Mexico border.
- The largest number of clients was forced into the sex industry (28%) while a large number also was trafficked for forced labor and sex (16%) or domestic servitude (14%) and other types of forced labor (31%).
- Most clients were in the United States for less than a year before contacting MIHRC (55% of those for whom data was available).

Of the 64 clients served, MIHRC provided social services to 63. Clients received services that addressed a variety of needs, with an average of 5.9 different services provided to each client led by victim services, denoting service coordination and facilitating engagement with law enforcement, housing, medical services, and communications and transportation assistance.

At the time of intake, many clients were in danger of being deported due to their undocumented status. Through December 2005, 18 MIHRC clients have been certified as victims of human

trafficking including three minors who had not received Continued Presence or a T-Visa. The great majority of clients has received other legal protections or is in the process of obtaining protections.

MIHRC has served as the key Midwest organization for educating persons about how to identify, provide services, and legally process victims of human trafficking. To this end, MIHRC has conducted over 230 trainings and presentations, with 8000 persons attending. MIHRC educated policy makers in Midwest states who, in turn, are evaluating ways to improve policies and laws combating human trafficking.

Evaluation Conclusions and Recommendations

- Training is critical in creating awareness, obtaining service, and changing practice. MIHRC has done much to disseminate information to a myriad of organizations and raise awareness among social service providers, law enforcement, legal providers, and health care providers, using a variety of communications methods and media.
 - It is recommended that a high level of training be continued. Even though MIHRC has succeeded in training a large number of professionals across a wide number of disciplines, continuing the trainings could result in more victims being identified.
 - As reflected in the law enforcement survey and anticipated by new Bureau of Justice task forces, increased training to local law enforcement, preferably in collaboration with federal law enforcement, is recommended to assist with role clarification.
 - A greater focus on efforts to raise public awareness on trafficking at a grassroots level throughout the Midwest would assist community members to identify and serve trafficking victims. MIHRC should continue its efforts to build working relationships with various ethnic communities and strengthen dialogue on the issues of trafficking and forced labor that may affect communities.
- Relationship building with law enforcement has resulted in a high rate of Continued Presence applications being granted. Law enforcement officials have demonstrated greater sensitivity to and awareness of human trafficking and have demonstrated a willingness to work with legal and social service providers who assist victims. The result has been greater trust in working together to pursue a case and grant Continued Presence for victims.
 - An effective anti-trafficking program requires legal advocates committed to working with law enforcement and victims without compromising the attorney/client relationship. MIHRC should continue to emphasize the collaborative relationship it has developed with law enforcement.
- MIHRC's experience affirms that the vast majority of trafficking clients require a range of social service assistance. MIHRC effectively utilized its referral network to fulfill these needs.

- MIHRC should continue to develop its service agency network referral list. Doing so will provide more opportunities for victims to receive the services they need in a convenient and appropriate manner.
- A critical gap in social services is the lack of appropriate housing. As MIHRC's data suggest, the majority of trafficking victims require shelter or housing assistance, but there are no shelter environments specialized for victims of trafficking.
 - Funds should be made available to establish and expand shelters appropriate to victims of human trafficking with care taken not to reduce space currently available for victims of domestic violence or homelessness.
- Interpretation services were necessary for 40% of MIHRC trafficking victims. MIHRC successfully met a diverse range of language needs highlighting the importance of this core capability in implementing other victim-based support services.
 - Effective counter-trafficking programs must ensure that interpretation services are available and that protocols are developed to train interpreters.
- MIHRC successfully advocated for child victims of human trafficking who presented unique needs and issues.
 - Protocols should be developed for child victims of human trafficking and implemented across the country in legal, social service and law enforcement settings.

In summary, sustained support for counter-trafficking efforts is recommended to maintain current momentum and strengthen networks developed in 2003-2005. Well-trained and appropriately funded legal and social service providers working at the community level are the critical link between trafficking victims, "Good Samaritans" and community members, and local, state, and federal law enforcement. The experience of MIHRC's counter-trafficking team will be useful to other groups trying to develop anti-trafficking programs in other states. Likewise, trained community-based organizations (CBOs) and law enforcement can provide best practices and/or technical assistance for those in other states that have not yet developed streamlined response mechanisms for trafficking victims.

References

- Aurora Police Department (2005). Aurora Police Department Website. Retrieved August 11th, 2005 from: <http://www.aurora-il.org/APD/index.html>
- Clawson, H. J. et al. (2003). *Needs assessment for service providers and trafficking victims*. Fairfax, VA: Caliber Associate, Inc.
- Coonan, T., et al. (2003). *Florida responds to human trafficking*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University Center for Advancement of Human Rights.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2003). *Uniform Crime Report*. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved August 11th, 2005 from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_02/02prelimannual.pdf.
- Free the Slaves and the Human Rights Center at University of California, Berkeley. (2004). *Hidden slaves: Forced Labor in the United States*. Washington, DC: Free the Slaves and Berkeley, CA: The Human Rights Center.
- Hughes, D. M. (2001). The “Natasha” trade: Transnational sex trafficking. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 9-15.
- Raymond, Janice G. and Hughes, Donna M. (March 2001). *Sex Trafficking of Women in the United States: International and Domestic Trends*. Retrieved 4/26/06 from site: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/187774.pdf>.
- US Department of State. (2004). *2004 Trafficking in Persons Report*. Washington, DC: Athor.

APPENDIX—PROJECT TOOLS

- 1) Letter of Inquiry to Law Enforcement Personnel
- 2) Phone Interview Questions for Law Enforcement (Federal, State, County, etc.)
- 3) General Law Enforcement Survey
- 4) Local Law Enforcement Survey
- 5) Service Providers Survey

Paulette Yousefzadeh
Research Assistant
Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP) of
Heartland Alliance for Human Needs and Human Rights
4411 N. Ravenswood Ave., 2nd Floor
Chicago, IL 60640
Phone: 773-728-5960, x278
Fax: 773-728-4907
maipassociate3@heartlandalliance.org

Dear ,

Hello! My name is Paulette Yousefzadeh and I am a research assistant at Heartland Alliance, Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP). Heartland is a human rights and social services agency that serves the Chicagoland area and MAIP serves as the research/advocacy arm of the organization. Elissa Steglich and Katherine Kaufka, attorneys at Heartland Alliance, Midwest Immigrant and Human Rights Center (MIHRC), gave me your name and contact information as someone who may be interested in participating in a research project on human trafficking

We are in the midst of conducting a needs assessment for MIHRC and the Victims of Trafficking Assistance Program (VTAP), for which we would like to interview those working in law enforcement. The purpose of the needs assessment is to examine the extent of services provided for trafficking victims, the experiences of law enforcement and service providers in working on trafficking cases, and potential areas wherein trafficking victims may be found. We wish to conduct a phone interview with you, which should take no longer than 30 minutes. During the interview, we would ask you questions about your knowledge of and experiences with trafficking cases. We would also like to discuss with you our ideas for a survey we are developing for front-line officers and workers. We would very much appreciate you taking the time to talk with us. Your feedback, experience, and insight into this subject matter would greatly aid us in our research.

If you are interested in sharing your knowledge, opinions, and experiences regarding human trafficking, please call or email me and we will work around your schedule to find a time to discuss the issues. If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the project, please do not hesitate to contact me. I thank you in advance for your time and look forward to speaking to you soon.

Best Regards,

Paulette Yousefzadeh

Phone Interview Questions for Law Enforcement (Federal, State, County, etc.)

1. Gender Male Female
2. How long have you been working at your position? _____
(dept, division, etc.)
3. What is your agency's average monthly caseload? _____
4. For how long has your department or agency been handling human trafficking cases?
5. How do you or would you identify a client as a victim of human trafficking?

- Victim's legal status (i.e., T visa recipient, legislation definitions)
- Victim's problems (assessed after intake)
- Victim's self-identification

6. How do you gain your knowledge on trafficking victims (check all that apply)?

- Educational training
- Academic conferences
- Scholarly articles, reports
- Personal knowledge
- Family member
- Direct work with other agencies, departments, or organizations
- Friend/Neighbor
- Professional knowledge
- Professional training
- Direct work with victims
- Interaction with co-workers
- Other: _____

(Please list: _____)

7. Have you attended formal workshops or classes on trafficking in persons?

- Yes (What were they?)
- _____
- _____

No

8. Have you received formal training on how to work with trafficking victims and handle their cases?

- Yes
- What type of training?
- _____
- _____

No

9. How comfortable are you with your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000?

No knowledge at all Expert knowledge	Little knowledge	Some knowledge	A lot of knowledge	
1	2	3	4	5

10. How comfortable are you with your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003?

No knowledge at all Expert knowledge	Little knowledge	Some knowledge	A lot of knowledge	
1	2	3	4	5

11. How many trafficking cases has your agency/department ever had? _____

12. When did you have your first trafficking case? _____

13. In the past year, since January 1, 2004, how many trafficking cases have you had?

If answers one or more for Question 10, continue with questions 13-19:

14. *Approximately* what percentage of your clients are:

Female _____%

Male _____%

15. What is the age range of trafficking victims you have served? _____

16. What countries do your trafficking victims represent?

17. What languages are spoken by most of your trafficking victims?

18. In what type of industries have your trafficking victims worked?

19. Which of the following best represents the status of your trafficking victims?

Immigrant (status) _____

Permanent resident

T visa

Refugee (status; legal vs. personal classification) _____

Other _____

20. In your own words, what tends to be the most common or typical trafficking case?

21. In what type of geographies/locations would you expect to find human trafficking cases?

22. What tends to be the general outcome of trafficking cases? (Plea bargain/agreement, conviction, case dropped/dismissed, etc.)

23. What are the hindrances to gathering evidence for these cases?

24. What are the pros and cons of the TVPA 2000?

25. What are the pros and cons of the Reauthorization 2003?

26. Other comments?

Informed Consent Form

Title: Needs Assessment for Heartland Alliance

Researchers: Curtis Jones and Paulette Yousefzadeh, Heartland Alliance, Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP)

The Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP) team at Heartland Alliance is conducting a needs assessment to identify some of the legal dilemmas that immigrants may experience in specific areas of the Midwest. We are also interested in exploring law enforcement's responses to these issues, as well as their experience and knowledge of legal protocol.

You will be given a survey that includes three brief case studies for you to read. You will then be asked to respond to some open-ended questions regarding the readings and your general experiences on the job. *This survey should take no more than 30 minutes to complete.*

While you may not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study, the knowledge gained could help improve our understanding of some of the legal barriers that immigrants face. With the research findings, we could potentially pinpoint some of the areas in which services to immigrants could be improved. The more participants we could have in our study, the more complete our data would be, which would better help us in addressing our research questions.

You may choose to skip any questions that you do not want to answer. Your participation in this study will be kept completely confidential. Your name and personal information is not required for this study, and we will only use a number to identify your responses to our survey. If you request that we remove your survey, we will do so, however any work we have done with your survey *prior to* your request cannot be undone. By completing this survey, you are demonstrating that you agree to participate in this study and understand its research goals.

Please do not use real names or other identifying information when filling out the survey.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact Paulette Yousefzadeh, Research Assistant, at maipassociate3@heartlandalliance.org or at 773-728-5960 x278.

Background Information

1. What is your gender? **Male** **Female**

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is your rank and current assignment? _____

4. When did you start your current assignment? _____

5. For how long have you been working in law enforcement? _____

6. In which geographical area(s) do you work? (Check all that apply.)

 Urban **Rural** **Suburban**

Case Scenario 1

In the course of an investigation of a local tool manufacturer suspected of committing labor code violations, you find yourself speaking with Antonio through an interpreter, a thirty-five year-old man from Mexico who has worked at the factory for one and a half years. You learn that the employees are paid less than half of minimum wage and work in a factory under harmful conditions, e.g., high temperatures, no ventilation, and locked exits. Antonio stands the entire day, working 15-hour shifts with no breaks, 6 days a week. Workers have no access to a bathroom. Antonio greatly fears his boss, a man notorious for his bad temper. Later, you discover that Antonio and most of the workers at the factory are immigrants with no legal status. You learn that they arrived in the US having been promised jobs in the factory that pay \$9/hour with paid vacation time. The smugglers charged each migrant several thousand dollars for transportation fees, and sold them to the factory owner, who then confiscated their passports and documents. The factory owner has threatened Antonio and the other workers that he would have their families tracked down and killed in Mexico if they ever tried to leave their jobs before having worked off all their debts.

1) Fill in the blank: This would be a case of _____. (You may provide more than one answer if you wish.)

2) Regarding your first answer, what is/are the red flag(s)?

3) How responsible do you find Antonio and the other workers for their predicament? (Please circle one answer.)

Not responsible at all		Somewhat responsible		Very responsible
1	2	3	4	5

4) Do you think these workers have committed any crimes? Why or why not?

5) Whom would you charge with what? On what information did you base your decision?

6) What course of action would you take for this case?

7) Which agencies and/or departments would you call to get involved in this case?

8) What additional information would you want to obtain and why?

9) Does this scenario remind you of any cases you've had? Describe the cases briefly.

10) In the past year, since Jan '04, how many cases have you come across or investigated that were similar to the scenario above? What were the charges made?

Case Scenario 2

An anonymous 911 caller reports that her neighbors, a married couple living across the street, behave strangely towards one of their children. While the other three kids go to school each day, the neighbor notices that one of them, who looks to be about 8 or 9 years of age, staying at home, sometimes staring out the window. In fact, the child never seems to leave the house, even when the rest of the family goes out. While investigating the home, you see a girl running for the stairs. You are able to apprehend the girl, and attempt to calm her down, but you realize that she does not speak English. Besides her being scared, you also notice that she is severely underweight and dressed in tattered clothes. Through a French interpreter, the girl, whose name is Cécile, reveals little by little that the married couple, Jean-Claude and Marie, are not her parents. Her parents live in a village in Haiti, and have offered their daughter to them to work as a maid in exchange for housing, food, clothing, and education. Cécile, you learn, is 12 years old. She is not allowed to go to school and must work from 6 AM until 9 PM, cooking, cleaning, doing yard work, and the laundry.

1) Fill in the blank: This would be a case of _____ . (You may provide more than one answer if you wish.)

2) Regarding your first answer, what is/are the red flag(s)?

3) Do you think she has committed any crimes? Why or why not?

4) Whom would you charge with what? On what information did you base your decision?

5) What course of action would you take for this case?

6) Which agencies and/or departments would you call to get involved in this case?

7) What additional information would you want to obtain and why?

8) Does this scenario remind you of any cases you've had? Describe the cases briefly.

9) In the past year, since Jan '04, how many cases have you come across or investigated that were similar to the scenario above? What were the charges made?

General Questions to Answer

1) What are types of scenarios that you would describe as “human trafficking?”

2) What are the types of scenarios that you would describe as “human smuggling?”

3) How would you rate your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000?

No knowledge at all Some knowledge Expert knowledge
1 2 3 4 5

4) How would you rate your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003?

No knowledge at all Some knowledge Expert knowledge
1 2 3 4 5

5) Have you received training on the TVPA? ___Yes ___No

6) Have you received training on the Reauthorization Act? ___Yes ___No

7) Would you like to receive (additional) training on the TVPA? ___Yes ___No

8) Would you like to receive (additional) training on the Reauthorization Act? ___Yes ___No

9) What is your opinion of the TVPA (both the 2000 and 2003 Acts) in terms of their strengths and weaknesses?

10) In your opinion, how well educated are the other officers about the law?

Not educated at all Somewhat educated Very well educated
1 2 3 4 5

11) How well is the law executed by the police?

Executed poorly		Somewhat well executed		Very well executed
1	2	3	4	5

12) How well is the law executed by the courts?

Executed poorly		Somewhat well executed		Very well executed
1	2	3	4	5

13) How common do you think is human trafficking in your community (where you work)?

Not common at all		Somewhat common		Very common
1	2	3	4	5

14) What barriers does law enforcement face in investigating possible cases of human trafficking?

15) What resources would enable you to pursue these cases more effectively?

16) Other comments?

Local Law Enforcement Survey **Informed Consent Form**

Title: Needs Assessment for Heartland Alliance

Researchers: Curtis Jones and Paulette Yousefzadeh, Heartland Alliance, Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP)

The Mid-America Institute on Poverty (MAIP) team at Heartland Alliance is conducting a needs assessment to identify some of the legal dilemmas that immigrants may experience in specific areas of the Midwest. We are also interested in exploring law enforcement's responses to these issues, as well as their experience and knowledge of legal protocol.

You will be given a survey that includes three brief case studies for you to read. You will then be asked to respond to some open-ended questions regarding the readings and your general experiences on the job. *This survey should take no more than 30 minutes to complete.*

While you may not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study, the knowledge gained could help improve our understanding of some of the legal barriers that immigrants face. With the research findings, we could potentially pinpoint some of the areas in which services to immigrants could be improved. The more participants we could have in our study, the more complete our data would be, which would better help us in addressing our research questions.

You may choose to skip any questions that you do not want to answer. Your participation in this study will be kept completely confidential. Your name and personal information is not required for this study, and we will only use a number to identify your responses to our survey. If you request that we remove your survey, we will do so, however any work we have done with your survey *prior to* your request cannot be undone. By completing this survey, you are demonstrating that you agree to participate in this study and understand its research goals.

Please do not use real names or other identifying information when filling out the survey.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact Paulette Yousefzadeh, Research Assistant, at maipassociate3@heartlandalliance.org or at 773-728-5960 x278.

Background Information

1. What is your gender? **Male** **Female**
2. What is your age? _____
3. What is your rank and current assignment? _____
4. When did you start your current assignment? _____
5. For how long have you been working in law enforcement? _____
6. In which geographical area(s) do you work? (Check all that apply.)

 Urban
 Rural
 Suburban

6. What course of action would you take for this case?

7. Which agencies and/or departments would you call to get involved in this case?

8. What additional information would you want to obtain and why?

9. Does this scenario remind you of any cases you've had? Describe the cases briefly.

10. In the past year, since Jan '04, how many cases have you come across or investigated that were similar to the scenario above? What were the charges made?

Case Scenario 2

An anonymous 911 caller reports that her neighbors, a married couple living across the street, behave strangely towards one of their children. While the other three kids go to school each day, the neighbor notices that one of them, who looks to be about 8 or 9 years of age, staying at home, sometimes staring out the window. In fact, the child never seems to leave the house, even when the rest of the family goes out. While investigating the home, you see a girl running for the stairs. You are able to apprehend the girl, and attempt to calm her down, but you realize that she does not speak English. Besides her being scared, you also notice that she is severely underweight and dressed in tattered clothes. Through a French interpreter, the girl, whose name is Cécile, reveals little by little that the married couple, Jean-Claude and Marie, are not her parents. Her parents live in a village in Haiti, and have offered their daughter to them to work as a maid in exchange for housing, food, clothing, and education. Cécile, you learn, is 12 years old. She is not allowed to go to school and must work from 6 AM until 9 PM, cooking, cleaning, doing yard work, and the laundry.

1. Fill in the blank: This would be a case of _____. (You may provide more than one answer if you wish.)

2. Regarding your first answer, what is/are the red flag(s)?

3. Do you think she has committed any crimes? Why or why not?

4. Whom would you charge with what? On what information did you base your decision?

5. What course of action would you take for this case?

6. Which agencies and/or departments would you call to get involved in this case?

7. What additional information would you want to obtain and why?

8. Does this scenario remind you of any cases you've had? Describe the cases briefly.

9. In the past year, since Jan '04, how many cases have you come across or investigated that were similar to the scenario above? What were the charges made?

General Questions to Answer

1. What are types of scenarios that you would describe as “human trafficking?”

2. What are the types of scenarios that you would describe as “human smuggling?”

3. How would you rate your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000?

No knowledge at all		Some knowledge		Expert knowledge
1	2	3	4	5

4. How would you rate your knowledge of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003?

No knowledge at all		Some knowledge		Expert knowledge
1	2	3	4	5

5. Have you received training on the TVPA? Yes No

6. Have you received training on the Reauthorization Act? Yes No

7. Would you like to receive (additional) training on the TVPA? Yes No

8. Would you like to receive (additional) training on the Reauthorization Act? Yes No

9. What is your opinion of the TVPA (both the 2000 and 2003 Acts) in terms of their strengths and weaknesses?

10. In your opinion, how well educated are the other officers about the law?

Not educated at all		Somewhat educated		Very well educated
1	2	3	4	5

11. How well is the law executed by the police?

Executed poorly		Somewhat well executed		Very well executed
1	2	3	4	5

12. How well is the law executed by the courts?

Executed poorly		Somewhat well executed		Very well executed
1	2	3	4	5

13. How common do you think is human trafficking in your community (where you work)?

Not common at all		Somewhat common		Very common
1	2	3	4	5

14. What barriers does law enforcement face in investigating possible cases of human trafficking?

15. What resources would enable you to pursue these cases more effectively?

16. Other comments?

MIDWEST IMMIGRANT & HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER Community Needs Assessment

We are interested in obtaining a better understanding of the types of problems persons in your community experience and how the Midwest Immigrant & Human Rights Center (MIHRC) can best apply its resources to address these problems. As part of our efforts to understand your community we want to ask you some questions about your agency and the community your agency serves. Please answer them to the best of your ability. Thank you for participating.

<i>1. What is your gender?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> male	<input type="checkbox"/> female
<i>2. What is your age?</i>		
<i>3. What is your current occupation/job title?</i>		
<i>4. When did you start?</i>		
<i>5. What is your cultural background?</i>		
<i>6. What cultural group(s) does your agency serve? (check all that apply)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Mexican	<input type="checkbox"/> Puerto Rican	<input type="checkbox"/> Polish
<input type="checkbox"/> Ethiopian	<input type="checkbox"/> Russian	<input type="checkbox"/> Filipino
<input type="checkbox"/> Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Bosnian	<input type="checkbox"/> Central American
<input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese	<input type="checkbox"/> Albanian	<input type="checkbox"/> South American
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgarian	
<input type="checkbox"/> Korean	<input type="checkbox"/> Czech	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavian	<input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
<i>7. Which geographical area(s) does your agency serve?</i>		
<i>8. What services does your agency provide? (check all that apply)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/> Social/ Acculturation/Cultural	<input type="checkbox"/> Vocational training
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal	<input type="checkbox"/> Language Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Job placement	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Community education/outreach
<input type="checkbox"/> Mental health	<input type="checkbox"/> Victim Services	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other(s)		
<i>9. What are some salient social issues facing the communities you serve? (check all that apply)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Poverty	<input type="checkbox"/> Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Affordable health care
<input type="checkbox"/> Affordable housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Undocumented immigrant legal issues
<input type="checkbox"/> Crime	<input type="checkbox"/> Racial/ethnic conflicts	<input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Human trafficking	<input type="checkbox"/> Drugs	<input type="checkbox"/> Gangs
<input type="checkbox"/> Other(s):		
<i>10. Which social issues are the most salient to the immigrant communities you serve and why?</i>		

