

MISSEY

Motivating, Inspiring, Supporting & Serving Sexually Exploited Youth
Statewide and National Advocacy Plan

March 1, 2008

MISSEY
Nola Brantley, Co-Director
470 27th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510-290-6450
Fax: 510-267-8849

MISSEY Statewide and National Advocacy Plan

Table of Contents

I.	Problem / Background.....	1
II.	Strategy.....	6
III.	Organizational Capacity.....	15
IV.	Endnotes.....	17

I. Problem / Background

The commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) is a vicious and heartbreaking crisis that is confronting nearly every country throughout the world. The U.S. Department of State 2007 Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report estimates that “each year, more than two million children are exploited in the global commercial sex trade.”¹ National governments have responded to commercially sexually exploited children in a variety of ways, creating anti-trafficking conferences, task forces, and anti-trafficking legislation. A legislative response in the U.S. came in 2005, when Congress passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, which provided resources for research and programs for domestic human trafficking in 2006 and 2007.²

While some think of the domestic sex trafficking of children and commercial sexual exploitation of children as different causes, they are in fact the same issue. The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (TVPA), passed by Congress in 2000 defined the “severe forms of trafficking in persons” as “sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age.”³ The U.S. Department of State 2007 TIP report states that “a victim need not be physically transported from one location to another in order for the crime to fall within these definitions.”⁴ Based on these descriptions, the domestic human sex trafficking of children includes the commercial sexual exploitation of children in the U.S.

The United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography report estimated that there are up to 300,000 youth being prostituted and living on the streets in the U.S.⁵ The Polaris Project, a national organization committed to combating human trafficking, has estimated “more than 200,000 American children [are] at high risk for trafficking into the sex industry each year.”⁶ The children who are being targeted and victimized by commercial sexual exploitation are getting younger and younger. Estimates for the average age of a minor currently being commercially sexually exploited in the US vary, with some stating 12 to 14.⁷ The fears of HIV/AIDS and STIs have created a greater demand for younger and younger children, as they are seen as “cleaner and safer.”⁸ No longer are children viewed as “substitutes” for adult women, but are increasingly in demand, creating a larger and more lucrative market for exploiters.

The children who are primarily at risk are our nation’s most vulnerable. The report entitled *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico* (hereafter, U.S. Study) found that poverty is “the most frequently cited explanation for the involvement of large numbers of children in sexually exploitative behavior,”⁹ while the children who were most at risk for being commercially sexually exploited were “runaway and throwaway children.”¹⁰ Many of these children come from dysfunctional & broken down families and have a history of abuse and/or neglect. What’s worse is that these vulnerable and traumatized street children are specifically targeted by exploiters because of their high levels of desperation. “The higher the level of desperation and need among the pool of potential recruits, the greater the impact persuasive strategies are likely to have,” says a UC Berkeley Human Rights Center report.¹¹ “Most of the girls that are referred to me through the police or courts have no idea they are being abused. The youth’s perceived connection to their abusers range from boyfriend to caring adult,” explains CSEC case manager Adela Rodarte.¹²

Sexual exploiters and abusers use of the Internet as a recruiting ground has amplified the problem and made it harder for law enforcement to detect and address. When taking into account child pornography, the U.S. Department of Justice (DoJ) Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section reported estimates of commercially sexually exploited children in the U.S. to be “somewhere between 100,000 and 3 million.”¹³ An estimate by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) almost a decade ago put the number of children who had received a sexual solicitation or approach of some type over the internet at 19% or 1-in-5 children in the U.S. in 1998.¹⁴

In recognition of the growing issue of human trafficking and CSEC, the U.S. DoJ recently created a Model State Anti-Trafficking Statue to help individual states' strengthen and enforce trafficking laws. California was one of 32 states that responded to that call and in 2005 passed the California Trafficking Victims Protection Act and the Human Trafficking Collaboration and Training Act, which increased sentences for perpetrators, established assistance to victims, aided law enforcement in developing coordinated responses to human trafficking and created statewide anti-trafficking task forces. While recognition on a state and national level is a positive step, this is only the first step in what needs to be a comprehensive, educated and coordinated response to this staggering epidemic.

More locally-focused actions like these are desperately needed. According to California's statewide report, *Human Trafficking in California*, California's "extensive international border, its major harbors and airports, its powerful economy and accelerating population, its large immigrant population and its industries" make California a "magnet" for people who commercially sexually exploit and abuse children.¹⁵ The U.S. Study also found that "pimp-controlled juvenile prostitution is closely associated with: escort and massage services; private dancing, drinking and photographic clubs; major sporting and cultural events; conventions; and selected tourist destinations,"¹⁶ of which California has many. Californians need to know their children are at risk and what they can do to protect them. With the creation of locally based efforts to educate parents, communities and children about the location and viciousness of these predators we will better protect all children. Simultaneously we will enable parents and communities to help law enforcement identify these violent sexual predators that abuse children; getting them off the streets and ensuring they cannot harm one more child.

Until recently, the children who have been victimized by commercial sexual exploitation have been relatively invisible to the systems that are set up to serve and protect them. Highlighting some of the social basis of this invisibility, researchers Hynes & Raymond cite that their invisibility is "anchored in two foundations: the traditional view of gender inequality which instrumentalizes women's bodies for sexual and reproductive use; and the more liberal view which redefines certain forms of sexual exploitation such as prostitution as work, legitimates the selling of sexual "services" as commerce, and reconstructs the female body as a commodity."¹⁷ Governments around the world have legitimized sexual exploitation of women and children as sex work, by naming the "sex sector" as a viable source of revenue, reporting it as 2 to 14% of their gross domestic product.¹⁸ In the U.S. and beyond, advertisements in popular culture displaying the sexualization and objectification of young girls and women are rampant. Popular rapper 50 Cent's song, entitled P.I.M.P., has been on 25 different Top 40's Charts for over 340 weeks. The presence of social constructs that devalue and sexualize women and children along with the multitude of messages in the media have desensitized both parents and children alike to the threat of commercial sexual exploitation. "The notion that prostitution is work," contends Melissa Farley, internationally known feminist researcher and clinical psychologist working against human sex trafficking, "tends to make its harm invisible."¹⁹

However, for the hundreds of thousands of children who are commercially sexually exploited every year, the harm is very real. NCMEC has reported that "the most tangible consequence for children involved in prostitution is the extremely high probability of suffering violent assault."²⁰ They report that immediate dangers include the "physical, mental, and emotional violence these children experience at the hands of pimps, madams, and customers."²¹ The "long-term dangers include health problems, drug addictions, adverse psychological effects, and even death."²² Frighteningly, local statistics from the Sexually Abused and Commercially Exploited Youth (SACEY) Program virtually mirror national statistics: 62% the participants have been raped (at least once) and over half have been involved in an abusive relationship.²³

The U.S. Study describes how far we have to go finding that, "few GOs [governmental organizations] and NGOs [non-governmental organizations] have begun to confront the policy and

service implications of either CSE or the CSEC in even the simplest terms. Hardly any have defined what is meant by either CSE or the CSEC and, fewer still, have integrated their definitions into formal policies and procedures.”²⁴ They also found that “for virtually all GOs, lack of coordination between the complex of local, county and state law enforcement, human service, and educational organizations on matters pertaining to child sexual exploitation” was “among the most serious policy and procedural problems confronting GOs as they seek to respond to the complex of needs presented by sexually exploited children.”²⁵ It is clear that local communities need help in identifying and providing opportunities for recovery for these non-traditional victims of domestic human trafficking. Once properly equipped, we know that educated, local networks, those which include *all* citizens, can develop the most effective ways to combat child abuse.

The Bay Area, specifically Alameda County, has become known as an area of activity for child sexual exploiters and abusers. The increasing incidence of CSEC was first noted in August of 2002 by then Alameda County presiding Juvenile Court judge, Brenda Harbin-Forte. She noticed an increasing trend of young girls between the ages of 13 and 17, who were arrested for “prostitution”, showing up in the Juvenile Courts. While picked up in Alameda County, many of the children actually originated from surrounding counties throughout the state. At the same time, law enforcement, mental and physical health providers and clinics, Juvenile Courts and Probation, Social Services, Public Defenders and other public and community systems serving youth were overwhelmed by this epidemic. The presiding judge requested the Interagency Children’s Policy Council (ICPC) of Alameda County further investigate the issue, of what they called at that time, “Minors in Prostitution”.

The resulting Executive Summary by ICPC cited that, “professionals in the field point out that child prostitution has *greatly* expanded over the past few years, with young people being trafficked locally between Richmond, Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose.”²⁶ The report also made clear that similar issues related to the lack of systems preparedness were pervasive on the local level stating that, “...the public system finds itself unprepared to address this growing trend and has failed to identify youth at risk of (or impacted by) sexual exploitation, or to provide specialized resources to successfully intervene. The situation is further exacerbated by the *lack of consistent cross-system assessment instruments; intake procedures, case management practices, and transitional supports* necessary to address the needs of minors victimized through sexual exploitation and related traumas.”²⁷

According to Oakland Police Department (OPD) statistics, they encountered 218 CSEC in between 2001 and 2002, while in May 2003 they identified 75 more.²⁸ In 2006 approximately 12% of the females OPD arrested for prostitution were minors.²⁹ Due to the widespread incidence of commercially sexually exploited children in their communities, East Bay children remain at a greater risk for being targets of sexual abuse and exploitation and are more likely to have a peer, family member, or someone they know in the community who is directly affected by child commercial sexual exploitation.

In response to the growing local trend public system partners and NGOs serving CSEC came together to form the Sexually Exploited Minors (SEM) Network. SEM Network collaborating agencies work in partnership to share information, resources and best practices, with the common goal of treating commercially sexually exploited children as victims. In addition to the work of ICPC several SEM Network organizational partners contributed to the work through various efforts that included targeted street outreach, development of teen clinic protocol for CSEC, culturally specific services for CSEC and development of expanded treatment services for CSEC in Alameda County. Through the work of the SEM Network and support of local politicians the city of Oakland issued a request for proposals in 2006, specifically focusing on services for sexually exploited minors. It was appropriate that this request was issued by the city of Oakland because it had become a known hub throughout the Bay Area and the nation for the commercial sexual exploitation of children, through child prostitution. Through this funding the Sexually Abused and Commercially Exploited Youth Program (SACEY) and

Safe Place Alternative (SPA) were established to serve CSEC in the city of Oakland. Because of the staff's reputation around successfully working with CSEC, MISSEY was added to the collaborating agencies that made up the SACEY/SPA Program as the program's main direct service provider soon after it was founded in July 2007.

Since then MISSEY has been involved in countless efforts to address this issue. Amongst those efforts are advocating for commercially sexually exploited children throughout the Juvenile systems, partnering with law enforcement to provide on-call advocacy to commercially sexually exploited children when they are cited, arrested or detained, providing countless professional trainings throughout the public systems, community awareness at local events, data collection to better inform programs and policy, participation in campaigns, assistance with police and District Attorney investigations and most importantly, court advocacy and case management for our clients.

Why do policies, programs & services need to change?

Not only do children face intense trauma by way of their sexual exploitation but they also face post-exploitation trauma when they interact with the public systems. Often a commercially sexually exploited child's first contact with the public systems is through arrest and detainment as opposed to intervention and recovery. Many children are not offered services even after arrest due to the fact that they are not being recognized as victims of human trafficking, but as delinquents. Norma Hotaling, an international anti-trafficking advocate, captures the current state of affairs for commercially sexually exploited children in Alameda County's systems: "In essence what, we the adults, are saying and enforcing through laws, and inappropriate interventions is that children and youth are consenting to their own sexual abuse and that by consenting to this abuse they are a danger to society, they are subject to arrest, they are the perpetrators not victims and they are to be denied any services for their victimization."³⁰ Our current policies that criminalize commercially sexually exploited children contribute to their re-victimization.

Because of these local policy failures it makes it challenging for service providers and public systems alike to provide commercially sexually exploited children with the programs and services they need to recover. These policy failures translate into a lack of services and programs available to commercially sexually exploited children. The U.S. Study's findings support this citing "for nearly all GOs, the absence of staff trained in the subtleties of child sexual exploitation versus other forms of child sexual abuse—including child sexual assault" posed a serious policy and procedural problem.³¹ Oakland typifies this gap, with only one case manager and one advocate assigned to provide services specifically to commercially sexually exploited children. Even with the current programs available providers face challenges in accessing additional services for these children.

One of the biggest gaps in services is the current lack of placement options for domestically trafficked children who have been commercially sexually exploited. This has been recognized both on the local and state level, with the latest statewide human trafficking report, *Human Trafficking in California*, finding "shelter is one of a trafficking victim's most critical needs, but California does not have enough appropriate shelter space to support the needs of human trafficking victims."³² It is imperative to create specialized options for CSEC, who are embedded within our Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice systems. These specialized placement options will reduce the fiscal burden caused by recidivism and housing CSEC in detention facilities.

Why does this issue need to be addressed now?

The opportunity we have now to confront the issue of commercially sexually exploited children is golden due to the concurrent actions happening on a national, state and local level. On a federal level, laws recently enacted provide increased resources for victims of domestic human sex trafficking. On a state level, California laws have been modernized to provide harsher sentences for predators that

sexually abuse and exploit children. Additionally the development of six regional anti-trafficking task forces can aid law enforcement in the prosecution of predators. On a local level, the momentum for change is building. Several important aspects have aligned, creating a situation that we must act on now. New funding received by the Alameda County District Attorney's Office will provide a D.A. and Victim Witness Advocate to work primarily on cases involving human trafficking. This will allow us to coordinate system-wide services for the first time with both governmental *and* non-governmental CSEC professionals. We now have a successful and stable program in Alameda County, which can be expanded and developed as a model for other cities or programs. If we can act now on this golden opportunity we can prevent the further traumatization, victimization and death of commercially sexually exploited children.

II. Strategies

Our strategy will create the foundation that is necessary for funding and policy development, which is urgently needed for the rescue and recovery of commercially sexually exploited children. We will use a multi-angle approach that engages a range of audiences which will include the community partnerships with community entities in order to implement many of the strategies. The outcomes will include: equipped community service providers so that they can respond to the specialized needs of CSEC; communities that will be able to keep children safe from the dangers of commercial sexual exploitation; informed policy makers, foundations and grant makers who will make responsible decisions regarding commercially sexually children; the emergence of CSEC specific programs and services throughout the public systems in California and increased awareness of CSEC throughout the nation.

This strategy is organized by three goals. Each goal has objectives followed by strategies and action steps. The action steps encompass the collaborating agencies and their roles as well as evaluation measures and timelines.

Goal #1

Public systems, families and communities across the state of California will be empowered and equipped to prevent, identify and respond to the commercial sexual exploitation of children. (July 2011)

Objective #1

NGOs will be aware of the CSEC issue and be provided with tools to identify and respond to CSEC in their community (July 2010)

Currently there is a gap in services specific to commercially sexually exploited children. NGO's come in contact with commercially sexually exploited children through various community, school and in-custody based services. Many of these organizations are not equipped to identify or respond to this population. Increased knowledge around this population will allow NGO's to better serve and/or refer this population to applicable services as well as better inform the development of specialized programs and services to meet their needs.

Strategy 1

Targeted trainings and education & awareness presentations with community-based, youth serving organizations across the state of California (July 2009).

Action Steps

1. Research all CSEC services providers throughout the state as well as governmental and private national resources (July 2008).
2. In partnership with Alameda County Sexually Exploited Minors Network develop state wide CSEC Service Provider Resource & Referral Card (July 2008).
3. In partnership with Alameda County Sexually Exploited Minors Network develop standard NGO CSEC-specific education & awareness presentation (July 2008).
4. In partnership with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and West Coast Mental Health Services develop CSEC service provider training curriculum (July 2008).
5. Identify NGOs across the state serving high risk youth populations by 12 regions, with a greater focus on Los Angeles County region and San Francisco Bay region (July 2008).
6. Plan and Schedule trainings, education & awareness presentations (January 2009).
7. Deliver trainings, education & awareness presentations and distribute training curriculum and CSEC Service Provider Resource & Referral Card to identified NGOs (July 2009).

8. Distribute CSEC service provider training curriculum & CSEC Service Provider Resource & Referral Card to additional NGOs throughout the state (July 2009).
9. Survey the NGOs to evaluate the application and effectiveness of the training curriculum and resources (June 2011, on-going).

Strategy 2

Organization of a statewide training and networking conference for identified NGOs and those who are interested in building organizational capacity for CSEC-specific services (July 2010)

Action Steps

1. Partner with five regional human trafficking task forces for conference development, recruitment and implementation (January 2009).
2. Develop conference structure, program & identify state and county conference sponsors (July 2009).
3. Develop website to publicize conference and begin online service provider community for sustained discussion and resource sharing (July 2009).
4. Outreach to identified & trained NGOs to request participation as a trainer, presenter or facilitator for conference (January 2010).
5. Send out conference information, registration and pre-conference NGO CSEC capacity assessment to NGOs around the state (January 2010).
6. Outreach to various NGO collaboratives by county to publicize the conference (January 2010).
7. Outreach to city & county agencies to promote participation of NGOs serving CSEC and those interested in building such organizational capacity (January 2010).
8. Follow-up with participant NGOs to track the capacity building possibilities through a post-conference assessment (January 2011).

Strategy 3

Create and implement CSEC specific state certified Advocate Program to certify volunteers as CSEC Advocates to provide on-call advocacy and crisis line support for commercially sexually exploited children (January 2010)

Action Steps

1. In partnership with Bay Area Woman Against Rape and Building Futures for Women and Children develop CSEC specific crisis counselor curriculum based on best practices of related existing trainings (ie: Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault/Rape, Child Abuse) (July 2008).
2. Outreach to and incorporate public systems partners, specifically law enforcement and medical health providers, as well as NGOs to aid in the development and delivery of CSEC specific state certified Advocate Program (January 2009).
3. In partnership with the California Alliance to Combat Trafficking and Slavery train & equip identified CSEC specific NGOs throughout the state with a state certified CSEC Advocate Program to train and certify volunteers as state certified CSEC Advocates (January 2010).
4. Analyze the partners' knowledge of, access to, responsiveness and effectiveness of the CSEC Advocate program volunteers through individual & group meetings with major CSEC referral sources (law enforcement, hospitals, juvenile detention facilities, Children & Family Services) (January 2011).

Objective #2

Communities will understand the impact CSEC have on the overall safety of children in their community and they will be better equipped to protect children and sexually exploited children in the community (January 2011).

There is an endless capacity for communities to be responsive to the issues of CSEC. The breadth of the impact stretches from parents, whose children have been victimized, to merchants, who have seen these children bought and sold outside their storefronts. The development of targeted community-based action plans could be a powerful tool for eradicating this issue at the community level. Communities learning how to partner with public systems are critical in order to develop networks for rescuing, stabilizing, and providing long-term services and placements options for CSEC in *their* communities.

Strategy 1

Outreach to faith-based communities, parent networks/PTAs, businesses, community groups to provide information on the impact of CSEC on the community as well as tools and resources for keeping children safe (July 2009).

Action Steps

1. In partnership with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and West Coast Mental Health Services-creation and publication of informative booklet on dangers and impact of the commercial sexual exploitation of children on one's community (July 2008).
2. Research and identify networks of faith-based communities, PTAs, business associations and community groups with active and diverse members across the state (January 2009).
3. In partnership with Coalition of Catholic Organizations Against Human Trafficking, Church Women International, Initiative Against Sexual Trafficking, Parent Teacher Associations and Merchant Associations outreach to identified networks' head offices to provide information on the impact of CSEC on the community and tools and resources for keeping children safe (i.e.: "Keeping All Children Safe: Understanding the Safety Impact of CSEC on Your Community") (July 2009).
4. Encourage identified networks to share and circulate CSEC information, tools and resources (July 2009).
5. Partner with identified networks to evaluate the impact CSEC information, tools and resources have had on their communities (January 2011, on-going).

Strategy 3

Supplement Neighborhood Watch curriculum to include information, safety precautions, steps and community resources regarding CSEC (January 2011).

Action Steps

1. In partnership with Oakland Police Department's Youth and Family Services Division develop supplemental CSEC curriculum to incorporate into Neighborhood Watch Association curriculum, both locally and statewide (July 2010).
2. Contact statewide and national Neighborhood Watch Associations and provide them with supplemental CSEC curriculum via large scale direct mail campaign (January 2011).
3. Meet with police departments throughout the Los Angeles County region and San Francisco Bay region to work on the incorporation of CSEC curriculum into Neighborhood Watch Associations' curriculum (January 2011).
4. Inform Neighborhood Watch Associations of updates and important information to know regarding the commercial sexual exploitation of children (ongoing).

5. Work with the Neighborhood Watch Associations to collect data and measure the application and effectiveness of the CSEC curriculum (June 2011, ongoing).

Objective #3

Inform, empower & mobilize the public systems to effectively respond to CSEC as victims (January 2011)

CSEC are embedded within the all of the public systems. Much of their post exploitation trauma takes places as a result of their contact with these systems and the systems' lack of awareness and understanding of this population as victims. Many times the perpetrators of these victims depend on the ignorance of the public systems to help perpetuate their victimization. The public systems are in a perfect position to identify and process these children as victims in a way that ultimately leads to them receiving the help and services they need to recover.

Strategy 1

Implement an outreach project to distribute printed materials to public systems to increase their knowledge and understanding of CSEC and ultimately positively change the way that CSEC are processed and access resources within the systems (January 2010)

Action Steps

1. In partnership with Youth Justice Initiative survey public systems to uncover the specific impact that CSEC have on the various systems (January 2008)
2. In partnership with Youth Justice Initiative and West Coast Mental Health Services- Creation and distribution of "CSEC in the Public Systems", which will serve as a guide for guide law enforcement, Children & Family Services, Probation & the Juvenile Courts across the state (July 2009)
3. Research governmental and non-governmental CSEC Resources throughout the nation (July 2008)
4. Creation and distribution of "CSEC Public Systems Resource Card" across the state (July 2009)
5. Creation of systems-wide cost analysis that shows the fiscal impact of CSEC on the various public systems due to their high rate of recidivism, runaway, pregnancy, STIs and arrest across the state (July 2009)
6. In partnership with Alameda County policy makers reach out to Juvenile Courts, Probation Chiefs, Police Chiefs and Children & Family Services Department Heads to distribute printed materials and share systems cost analysis in Los Angeles County region and San Francisco Bay Area region (January 2010).
7. Track the recidivism rate and emergence of specialized programs and services across the public systems as an assessment measure (June 2011, on-going).

Strategy 2

Hold regional forums for Children & Family Services staff, administration and local policy makers to explore how the Children & Family Services Division can be modernized to accommodate commercially sexually exploited children as a pervasive, special group of victims within their system (January 2011).

Action Steps

1. In partnership with California Department of Social Services and County Boards of Supervisors develop forum structure, goals and identify local policymakers as partners (July 2010).

2. In partnership with policymakers, recruit Children & Family Services administrators and department directors to participate in forum (July 2010)
3. In partnership with the Children and Family services divisions combine individual forum outcomes into a status & recommendations report which can be shared with the State Department of Children & Family Services (January 2011).
4. Chart and map the emergence of CSEC specific programs & services, placements etc. within Children & Family Services throughout the state (June 2011, ongoing).

Strategy 3

Advocate within the state & county education systems to amend the mandated child abuse training for educators to include CSEC-specific training and provide information for educators (January 2011).

Action Steps

1. Work in partnership with the Alameda County Office of Education advocate at the state level to have the inclusion of CSEC-specific training information mandated for all California schools (July 2009)
2. Work with county offices of education to provide educators with the option of CSEC specific trainings and information across the state (July 2010)
3. Partner with county offices of education and individual school districts within those counties to assist in the implementation of CSEC-specific training at the district level, specifically within the Los Angeles County region and San Francisco Bay region (January 2011)
4. Map and record the school districts across the state that implement CSEC specific training for school staff and administration (June 2011, ongoing).

Goal #2

By January 2011 people across the nation will be aware of the commercial sexual exploitation of children, equip to identify its victims and perpetrators and empowered to take action and mobilize around the issue.

Objective #1

Launch a national public awareness media campaign that introduces CSEC as non-traditional victims of child sexual abuse and exploitation and illustrates the societal risks (July 2010)

A national public awareness campaign will be the catalyst for shifting and awakening the national consciousness around the issue of commercially sexually exploited children. In order to manifest this consciousness shift we must introduce this non-traditional child victim to the nation. The public's perception ranges from total unawareness to deep misunderstanding. The public must understand who this child is, why they are targeted and victimized and what keeps them vulnerable.

Strategy 1

Create a series of public service announcements for both television and radio that aim to progressively introduce the nation to CSEC, the horrors of their abuse and the risk their abuse imposes on society and finally offers a solution of hope (January 2010).

Action Steps

1. Coordinate a diverse team of people involved in the CSEC issue to serve as the Public Service Announcement advisory body (July 2008).

2. In partnership with various youth and adult serving organizations hold a series of community focus groups to gather input for public service announcements' content (January 2009).
3. Partner with local youth-serving NGO with the capacity to cast and produce series of PSAs (January 2009).
4. Identify and partner with media agencies to develop, produce and aid in the distribution of PSA (January 2010).
5. Develop and carry out a coordinated evaluation plan to determine the effectiveness of the national public awareness media campaign through engaging professionals in the field of assessment & evaluation (to be determined by media/ evaluation professionals).

Strategy 2

Create a series of targeted print public service announcements that identifies the commercial sexual exploitation of children as child abuse and gives the common citizen mechanisms to prevent, protect and report the commercial sexual exploitation of children (January 2010).

Action Steps

1. Partner with Office of the Attorney General to create and distribute various forms of printed material, including posters, pamphlets to governmental organizations based on media best practices (July 2009)
2. Identify and partner with transportation and communications agencies throughout the nation to include CSEC print PSAs (July 2009)
3. Distribute various forms of printed material to various national, state and local agencies & organizations (i.e.: state Departments of Education, PTAs, mental health providers, NGOs, religious organizations, state Attorney General Offices, Children & Family Services etc...) (January 2010)
4. Develop and carry out a coordinated evaluation plan to determine the effectiveness of the national public awareness media campaign through engaging professionals in the field of assessment & evaluation (to be determined by media/ evaluation professionals).

Strategy 3

Build an online community through an informative and interactive website that provides people with a further introduction and exploration of CSEC issues while providing statistics, tools, community & government resources and the opportunity to take action within their school, communities, churches etc.. (July 2010).

Action Steps

1. Identify partner in the field of web development to lead in the creation of CSEC specific online community (January 2010).
2. Research, develop and compile website content from various CSEC serving organizations throughout the country (July 2010).
3. Develop monthly CSEC e-newsletter to keep audiences informed and engaged in CSEC issues in their local and state communities (July 2010).
4. Regularly update online community with legislative efforts and policy updates, new tools and resources and current efforts to address the commercial sexual exploitation of children (ongoing).
5. In coordination with the website development partner, track the incidence of one-time and repeat usage (ongoing).

Goal #3

Policy makers, foundations and grantmakers across the state of California will be aware and informed of the commercial sexual exploitation of children resulting in increased policy and funding development for the population (January 2011).

Objective #1

Policy makers will understand the impact CSEC have on the public systems & community and the necessity of an urgent response to the issue (January 2011).

One of the fastest growing forms of child abuse in the United States is the commercial sexual exploitation of children. It is vital that the policy makers are aware of this growing population of children victims and educated about the specific issues that impact them and contribute to their victimization. The development of policy that establishes them as victims, free of criminalization, is necessary before programs, services and public systems can respond to them as such.

Strategy 1

Influence policy makers throughout the state to sponsor and support CSEC-specific legislation (July 2010).

Action Steps

1. Research costs and impact of CSEC on public health and public safety (July 2008).
2. In partnership with the Salvation Army's Promise Initiative furnish policy makers with cost and data analysis reports on the CSEC impact on public systems, public health and public safety (January 2009).
3. Identify leaders amongst state policymakers in the Northern and Southern region of the state who can engage their colleagues around CSEC-specific legislation (July 2009).
4. Provide support to identified leaders through sharing of information, statistical reports, service recommendations and education & awareness (January 2010).
5. Identify legislators across the state to sponsor CSEC-specific legislation (January 2010).
6. Connect identified sponsors to governmental and non-governmental entities in their district who are engaged in CSEC advocacy as well as key stakeholders (July 2010).
7. Track the number of CSEC specific legislative efforts and achievements across the state (June 2011, ongoing)

Strategy 2

Inform special interest groups to help bring the CSEC issue to the legislative agenda as a priority (January 2011).

Action Steps

1. Research special interest groups that specialize in advocacy around child abuse, sexual assault and domestic violence across the state to provide written material on the CSEC issue (January 2009).
2. In partnership with National Research for Women and Families, Center for Women's Policy Studies, the American Civil Liberties Union, Advocates for Youth and the Children's Defense Fund outreach to high impact groups among those that specialize in advocacy around child abuse, sexual assault and domestic violence and provide more in depth information regarding the CSEC issue (January 2010).

3. Challenges identified groups to develop CSEC legislative priority areas and strategize to bring priorities to the state legislative agenda (January 2011).
4. Survey identified special interest groups for their top-five legislative priorities to measure the impact of our direct outreach (June 2011, ongoing).

Objective #2

Furnish foundations and grant makers with CSEC data to bolster new CSEC-specific funding streams (January 2011)

It is necessary that foundations and grant making organizations are aware of the CSEC issue and the absence of and gaps in services. These viable sources of support must be provided with adequate data, background information, and population needs. With better-informed foundations and grant makers comes the prospect of population-specific funding to create and expand CSEC specific services available to communities around the nation.

Strategy 1

Collect and compile current available CSEC data for distribution (July 2010).

Action Steps

1. Identify CSEC-specific organizations throughout the nation and obtain available data on the population (January 2009).
2. Research existing CSEC data being kept through various governmental systems (July 2009).
3. In partnership with West Coast Mental Health Services, Salvation Army Promise Initiative and Polaris Project create CSEC data, background information and population needs report (January 2010).
4. Distribute report to foundations throughout the nation via direct mail (July 2010).
5. Survey identified foundations that were provided with CSEC specific data to measure how the data will inform their future funding allocations (June 2011, ongoing).

Strategy 2

Direct outreach to identified non-government funding sources that traditionally fund high-risk populations (January 2011).

Action Steps

1. Research and contact major non-government funding sources that traditionally fund high-risk populations (July 2010).
2. Distribute report to identified funding sources (January 2011).
3. Follow-up with identified funding sources to measure the report's impact on current funding allocation and prospects of CSEC-specific funding opportunities (June 2011, ongoing)
4. Map & record non-government funding sources that establish CSEC specific funding streams or prioritize funding projects targeting CSEC (June 2001, ongoing)

In closing this approach will be successful because it will fully examine the CSEC issue in the best interest of each audience that we intend to engage and affect. It will further provide them with the information and resources needed to create positive change for CSEC and move the issue forward. Overall, the strategy will provide targeted solutions to identified audiences to address the current problem of CSEC and create a national movement. The solutions will incorporate the use of best practices, data analysis and research and expertise of professionals working on the CSEC issue.

To help direct the strategic plan, we will first complete an assessment of the local efforts through independently facilitated meetings with local stakeholders included but not limited to local law enforcement, policy makers, juvenile courts & probation, prosecutors, child welfare, medical & mental health service providers and CSEC-specific programs and services. We will use the local assessment not only to guide us in our strategic plan implementation but also to help us refine current local efforts as our model for success.

III. Organizational Capacity

Motivating, Inspiring, Supporting & Serving Sexually Exploited Youth (MISSEY) was established in response to an urgent need in Alameda County, the state of California and the nation for the emergence of organizations that solely focus on the issue of the commercial sexual exploitation of children. MISSEY's mission is to respond to the specialized and complex needs of sexually exploited children through advocacy, specialized treatment and recovery services, professional training and data reporting. MISSEY understands that the sexual exploitation of children is child abuse. We are committed to the idea that sexually exploited children need specialized services that focus on victimization and recovery and redirection toward empowerment and safety. MISSEY was born out of a movement in Alameda County to recognize and protect children impacted by child sexual abuse especially in the form of commercial child sexual exploitation.

Our four co-founders have pioneered and developed services for CSEC in Alameda County that include establishing the first recovery and healing drop-in service center for sexually abused and commercially exploited children, pioneering the first case management treatment service model, the first sexually exploited minors intensive case management program and the first on-call advocacy protocol for commercially sexually exploited children with Oakland Police Department and Alameda County Juvenile Detention Facility. MISSEY's co-founder, Nola Brantley, travels locally and throughout the state of California speaking and listening to diverse audiences and is described by audiences as a passionate and powerful speaker. As MISSEY's co-director she has been recognized in Alameda County and throughout the state of California as an advocate and leading professional for commercially sexually exploited children. She is relied upon by public systems, NGOs and private agencies serving CSEC.

The capacity of our organization to be effective, efficient and creative is great. Not only is our capacity represented by the dedicated and close-knit team of individuals that make up MISSEY, but the extended networks of amazing and talented professionals and community members we are a part of and the community at large.

Individual members have a combined total of 15 years working with commercially sexually exploited children and a total of 25 years working in social justice. We comprise a large skill base as well as a huge capacity for learning. Adela Rodarte, who leads MISSEY's Child Advocacy, comes to us highly recommended from the Alameda County Public Defender's Office, Dependency Division. During her five years with the Public Defender's Office she gained an understanding of and connection to the juvenile courts that is an invaluable asset to our work. Sarai Smith, who leads MISSEY's Life Development, is a wealth of resources as a result of her many years providing direct services to foster care youth, homeless youth and victims of domestic and sexual violence. As well we know that "asking for help" on project research, development, implementation and evaluation isn't a bad thing, as we are looking to include dozens of hours of expertise from professionals in various fields.

While some of the barriers to our work are unforeseen, there is much we recognize now. The main barrier that we foresee to implementing this plan is MISSEY's current staff constraints. Currently MISSEY has two paid staff and two volunteers. Between the four of us we cover a whole host of CSEC work, from on-call advocacy to intensive case management. Our single advocate has over twenty pending cases and our single case manager has over thirty-five on-going cases. As we launch this plan, based on our local experience we anticipate a great increase in the demand for direct and indirect services which MISSEY cannot meet as it's currently staffed. To address this main barrier MISSEY will partner with the Sexually Exploited Minors Network, The East Bay Community Foundation and the Alameda County Family Justice Center for fund development. As funding is

obtained, MISSEY will hire additional staff to deliver current programs and to respond to the increased demand for services brought about by the implementation of this plan.

In review of the strategies, the following were potential barriers that arose in working with partners, both GOs, NGOs and the community. Several NGOs throughout the state and country are already stretched. Many times NGOs take on some of the most profound issues facing the community. In many communities the time and availability of NGO staff is limited, due to the pressing needs of the community. To compound this, the funding landscape has taken a downturn over the past several years with state and federal funding reallocations becoming a yearly fact, stretching NGO staff even further.

The same rings true on a public systems level. Many people working within the public systems feel constrained by the lack of options that are available and the access to proper services for the children they serve. Currently, the amount of victim services available to commercially sexually exploited children is minimal. When the systems start to process and treat these children as victims, they will find there are few CSEC specific services.

Additionally, these children have been relatively invisible within the systems because they often do not represent as traditional victims. As non-traditional victims they sometime seem uncooperative, unwilling to participate in recovery services and prosecution efforts and not in need of services in general because of the manipulation, coercion and trauma they have experienced. These same factors also play a role in the visibility of this population as non-traditional victims on a societal level. The preconceived notions about prostitution and harsh societal stigmas around women in prostitution make it hard to divide the issues faced by *children* who are commercially sexually exploited and those of adults. On top of this, it is hard to sort out and prioritize the many horrific and traumatic events happening at the same time and more so, what to do about them. On a similar level, opportunities to directly outreach to policy makers and funders, both governmental and non-governmental are limited.

The scope of our strategic plan stretches over three years. The total estimated funding needed to implement the plan is \$800,000. The majority of the funding would be used to cover staff salaries, consultants in expertise fields (i.e.: media & evaluation), the national television/radio/print public awareness campaign and CSEC publications and forums and conferences. Currently 93% of MISSEY's funding comes from the city of Oakland Measure Y initiative, which funds the case management and advocacy services. The additional 7% comes from the EBCF, which is funding the development of this plan and staff development. We will secure the full funding amount from public and/or private sources through donations, grants and fundraising efforts. Our partnerships with the East Bay Community Foundation and the Alameda County Family Justice Center will be critically important resources to reaching our funding goal.

Even though there are barriers that exist, we are confident in the success of the planning and implementation of our Statewide and National Advocacy Plan. We believe that the strategies are focused yet flexible enough to accommodate the realities we will face. We are very grateful to the East Bay Community Foundation and The Hancock-Catron fund for their interest in this issue and the tremendous opportunity given us to develop this plan. We hope that you have been inspired by our vision and are compelled to join us in building a grassroots movement towards a society safe for all children who are targeted and victimized by commercial sexual exploitation.

IV. References

- ¹ United States Department of State. (2007). *Trafficking in Persons Report*. (USDS Publication 11407). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 28 [hereinafter *Trafficking in Persons Report*].
- ² Trafficking Victims Protections Reauthorization Act of 2005, H.R. 972, 109th Cong., 1st Sess. (2005).
- ³ Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act of 2000, H.R. 3244, 106th Cong., 2nd Sess. (2000).
- ⁴ *Trafficking in Persons Report*, p.7.
- ⁵ Petit, Juan Miguel. (1996). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography*. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights. (U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/1996/100). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- ⁶ Polaris Project. (n.d.). *What is Human Trafficking?* Retrieved February 16, 2008 from <http://www.polarisproject.org>.
- ⁷ Lee, Lois and Knickerbocker, Brad. (1996, October 23). Prostitution's Pernicious Reach Grows in the US. *Christian Science Monitor*.
- ⁸ Interagency Children's Policy Council of Alameda County. (2003). *Minors in Prostitution: Sexually Exploited Minors Task Force Report Executive Summary*, p. 6 [hereinafter *Minors in Prostitution*].
- ⁹ Estes, R. J. and Weiner, Neil A. (2001a). *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, p.3 [hereinafter Estes & Weiner, 2001a].
- ¹⁰ Estes & Weiner, 2001a, p. 144.
- ¹¹ Human Rights Center. (2005). *Freedom Denied: Forced Labor in California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, p. 11.
- ¹² Adela Rodarte, personal communication, February 15, 2008.
- ¹³ Barnitz, Laura A. (1998). Children for Sale: Youth Involved in Prostitution, Pornography and Sex Trafficking. *Youth Advocate Program International Report*, Vol. 3(2), p. 1, citing Marsha Liss, U.S. Department of Justice Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section attorney.
- ¹⁴ Finkelhor, David, Mitchell, Kimberly and Wolak, Janis. (2000). *Online Victimization: A Report on the Nation's Youth*. National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.
- ¹⁵ California Alliance to Combat Trafficking and Slavery Task Force. (2007a). *Human Trafficking in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Office of the Attorney General, p. 15 [hereinafter *Human Trafficking in California*, 2007a].
- ¹⁶ Estes & Weiner, 2001a, p. 60.

- ¹⁷ Hynes, Patricia H. and Raymond, Janice G. (2002). Put in Harm's Way: The Neglected Health Consequences of Sex Trafficking in the United States. *Policing the National Body: Sex, Race, and Criminalization*, Cambridge, MA: South End Press, p. 197.
- ¹⁸ Klain, Eva J. (1999). *Prostitution of Children and Child-Sex Tourism: An Analysis of Domestic and International Responses*. Alexandria, Virginia: National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, p. 38.
- ¹⁹ Farley, Melissa. (2004). "Bad for the Body, Bad for the Heart": Prostitution Harms Women Even if Legalized or Decriminalized. *Violence Against Women, Vol. 10(10)*, p 1089.
- ²⁰ National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. (n.d.). *What is the Prostitution of Children?* Retrieved February 2, 2008, from <http://www.missingkids.com> [hereinafter NCMEC].
- ²¹ NCMEC, n.d.
- ²² NCMEC, n.d.
- ²³ Sexually Abused and Commercially Exploited Youth Program. (2007). SACEY Assessment Report.
- ²⁴ Estes, R. J. and Weiner, Neil A. (2001b). *The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico (Executive Summary)*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, p. 22.
- ²⁵ Estes & Weiner, 2001b, p. 22.
- ²⁶ *Minors in Prostitution*, p. 2.
- ²⁷ *Minors in Prostitution*, p. 3.
- ²⁸ *Minors in Prostitution*, p. 2.
- ²⁹ Lt. K. Wiley, personal communication, February 25, 2008.
- ³⁰ Hotaling, Norma. "Protecting Our Children – Working to End Child Prostitution." Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. 13 Dec. 2002. Retrieved from http://www.sagesf.org/html/info_briefs_speech.htm.
- ³¹ Estes & Weiner, 2001b, p. 22.
- ³² *Human Trafficking in California*, 2007a, p. 54.