

## **WORTH Court: Cumberland County Human Trafficking Court**

### **Program Year #1 Application – Key Components Evaluation & Program Year #2 Proposal**

#### ***1) Education about Human Trafficking, The Role of Courts in Supporting Recovery of Survivors, and Collaboration Process and Outcomes.***

##### **A. Note: Education about Human Trafficking**

**Primary Process for the Court:** To create local community awareness of human trafficking. This has been achieved by Judge King and the WORTH Court team and will continue into Program Year #2.

**Activities:** The following were conducted by Judge King and the WORTH Court Team: Presentations to First Baptist Church 11AM Worship Service S, First Presbyterian Church SALT Group, Cumberland County Health Department Nursing Staff, Cumberland County Bar Association, Cumberland County Dem Women, Cumberland County Courthouse staff, live news presentations with local ABC and CBS affiliate TV stations.

**Education Re-enforcement:** Court staffing sessions, community presentations with recognition of WORTH Court formation, Fayetteville Observer news articles on WORTH Court, local and regional distribution of human trafficking data, local/regional/state distribution of WORTH Court outcome data.

**Secondary Process for Service Providers:** WORTH Court Advisory Council meetings conducted for local court and bar association members and local/regional/state providers with updates on human trafficking issues, information sharing by the WORTH Court Team of CEC training sessions on human trafficking issues (trauma, case management, resource identification and development, clinical care, care plan development, housing, grants, mental health services) with our network providers.

**Activities:** Pre-court or court staffing meetings for WORTH Court service providers, compilation and distribution and education on WORTH Court HIPAA Guidelines.

##### **B. Note: Role of the Courts in Supporting Recover of Survivors**

**Primary Process:** Develop a WORTH Court provider network to support the court activities to support survivors. Create a continuum of provider recruitment to render services relative to a human trafficking program care plan. Execute MOU's with each service provider to render the specific services. Judge King and the WORTH Court Team have conducted these activities in Program Year #2 and will expand these activities into Program Year #2 will additional service providers.

**SAFE Providers:** A review process or validation/screening process was to be conducted by NCCASA within Program Year #1. This did not happen. Judge King and the WORTH Court Team

can make this oversight and Quality Assurance activity occur with the services of a credentialed consultant unaffiliated with any of our current service providers. This would ensure that we meet a basic high performance standard for WORTH Court that was outside our programmatic control in Program Year #1.

**Activities:** For Program Year #1, Judge King and the WORTH Court Team established WORTH Court protocols for services providers and incorporated them into MOU's, required service providers to attend court staffing sessions for juvenile and adult court, required that service providers send updates on survivors counseling attendance to court staff for review and identification of consumer needs for collaborative actions, obtaining data from service providers on demographics, trending, clinical progress, and outcomes for reporting. For Program Year #2, Judge King and the WORTH Court Team will continue these activities and enhance data collection to reflect modification to processes that illustrate changes that would ensure a greater success for a newly formed human trafficking court.

**Reporting:** For Program Year #1, WORTH Court reported data to our granting entity before the end of each quarter and often resulting report was never available timely (30 days following the end of the quarter). Our data is compiled in real time. Within 5 days of a court session, we have our data updates for staff review. Thus, for Program Year #2, Judge King and the Worth Court Team will continue to compile notes in each court session, cross reference those notes immediately, and the Court Coordinator will enter data and notes into our data base within 5 business days. At this point, everyone connected with WORTH Court can execute action steps on behalf of the survivors and the court system. The Court Coordinator can review the data for trending and compile/report trending information. Our Program Year #1 data collection and reporting system was created by WORTH Court locally without any assistance or recommendations from a consultant(s) or the funding entity, even though early in the funding cycle technical assistance had been requested. Our own system has worked very well to meet our internal needs to date. As we move forward, we may find a need to revamp the system.

### **C. Note: Collaboration Process and Outcomes**

**Initial Process:** In Program Year #1, WORTH Court would be constituted as a central point of contact in the formation of a human trafficking collaborative between local judicial processes and community activities working together for survivors of human trafficking. This has occurred as a result of Judge Toni S. King and the WORTH Court Team focusing on the intent outlined in the HT Commission grant and the strength of the Cumberland County community to address human trafficking. Between September 2019 and March 2020, WORTH Court enrolled 12 service providers, 36 participants, graduated 1 person, conducted 13 local education sessions, and attended/zoomed twelve continuing education sessions related to human trafficking identified by them to support their work with WORTH Court.

**Activities:** In Program Year #1, we were fortunate that several service providers agreed early in 2019 to support the efforts of Judge Toni S. King to implement a human trafficking diversion court in Cumberland County. These providers agreed to provide in-kind time to meet the needs

of survivors and participate in the WORTH Court Advisory Council. Thus, began a solid collaborative process and partnership. From this start, other providers came forth with our outreach efforts and community awareness presentations. Each new community presentation will bring forth a new professional entity or person with a willingness to support in some manner the work of WORTH Court. Specific collaboration focuses on the basic human needs identified in the service provider assessments that are used in the care plan development. Housing, food, shelter, clothing, employment, and safety are essential to the care plan.

**On-going Processes:** From our “Best Practices” learned and documented in Program Year #1, we propose to move into Program Year #2 with a focus on strengthening Human Trafficking Case Management with our service providers and developing a Human Trafficking Housing Program. Both of these can be built upon the WORTH Court work from Program Year #1 with our existing collaborative providers and some new partnerships. Additionally, we will seek greater human trafficking awareness opportunities with partnerships with our higher education institutions and our local public education system as we reach out to young people. In Program Year #1 we receive grant funds for Year #2 for juvenile housing.

**Activities:** In Program Year #1 we sought insight and advice from local and regional entities and persons with expertise in case management models, to include the training institute at UNC that is in collaboration with a southeastern network. Human trafficking is a component that they will include in forthcoming training sessions. This will include training in partnership from Vanderbilt University, University of Florida, Emory University, UNC, and University of Alabama – Birmingham. As for housing, we sought insight and advice from local and regional entities and persons with a background in housing program sustainability and details in daily operations. In our discussions, various options for juveniles and adults emerged for Program Year #2 that included several HUD projects that WORTH Court may be able to collaborate with in partnership. One of the options is a 6 bedroom/6 bath residential group home in Aberdeen, NC that currently is vacant that can offer us a transitional setting. As previously noted, Judge King and the WORTH Court Team have explored all these options and continue to seek support care opportunities on our own without the support/help of previously designated consults from Program Year #1.

**Residual Processes:** WORTH Court will add to the Program Year #1 “Best Practices” updates from the Program Year #2 collaborations and process updates as a template for implementing other human trafficking courts in North Carolina. The Template will be based on the “Best Practices” 12 Components as a guide that is reflective of our practical experiences.

**Activities:** For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will move forward utilizing our Program Year #1 “Best Practices” as a guide for standardization of a human trafficking diversion court. Each of the “Best Practices” will be strengthened and formalized as we move forward into Year #2.

**Reporting:** For the HT Commission, we will report a quarterly as required. Our data set has the capacity to report monthly and we can do so upon demand usually within 5 days after a court

session. Thus, as needed for WORTH Court purposes we will collect data on a continuum and report data monthly and complete education awareness summaries at the end of each event.

## **2) Consultative Assistance to establish Trauma Informed Court Responses and Courtroom.**

**Consultative Entity:** This component of the Program Year #1 grant Service Plan was not completed.

**Assistance Defined:** The approach for delivery of assistance was never defined for Program Year #1.

**Referral Processes:** There were no referral processes for this grant activity in Program Year #1.

**Referral Sources:** No referral sources or sub-recipient sources were identified or procured to provide services or consult in Program Year #1.

**Evaluation Processes:** Due to no consultative assistance, there was no evaluation for Program Year #1 other than the grant recipient did not procure the service delivery agent(s).

## **3) Consultative Services to work with the Pilot Court Judge to establish a Protocol for Addressing Human Trafficking Survivors, including Referrals from Other Cumberland County Courts.**

**Consultative Entity:** The component of the Program Year #1 grant Service Plan was not completed with no consultative services being provided.

**Protocol & Language:** No consultative services were provided and no training opportunity(ies) were scheduled for Judge Toni S. King.

**Referral Processes - Internal:** Not applicable in Program Year #1 due to no training scheduled.

**Referral Sources - Internal:** Not applicable in Program Year #1 since no training scheduled with guidance on how to identify and recruit referral sources.

**Referral Processes – External:** Not applicable in Program Year #1 due to no training scheduled.

**Referral Sources – External:** Not applicable in Program Year #1 since no training scheduled with guidance no how to identify and recruit referral sources.

**Evaluation Processes:** Due to no consultative assistance, there was no evaluation for the Program Year #1 other than the grant recipient did not procure the service delivery consultant agent(s).

#### **4) Involvement of Human Trafficking Survivors to inform aspects of certain Key Components of This Plan.**

**Client/Consumer Participation Protocol:** Judge King and the WORTH Court Team, along with the WORTH Court Advisory Council, has set forth some guidelines and standards for graduates of WORTH Court to participate in our success and growth.

**Client/Consumer Participation Process:** Each WORTH Court survivor will be offered options to continue supportive care beyond program graduation to ensure life success. Judge King requests that a survivor create a “Life Plan” that is self-directed and self-designed with goals that are attainable. This individual outline for human growth, step-by-step planning, achievement, and outcomes is the result of mentoring by the court and the service providers. This process was created in total by the WORTH Court Judge and Court Team without consultant support.

**Education on Protocol & Process:** In Program Year #2, WORTH Court will design a more formal structure to the Consumer Participation Protocol as we have more WORTH Court graduates. The structure for this protocol will begin to formulate with greater consumer input and some consultant recommendations that we have identified.

**Evaluation Processes:** We have no evaluation process for Program Year #1 since there was no consultant services to provide a plan for consumer participation. But, as WORTH Court has proceeded with “Best Practices” documentation we included “Consumer Participation” options and thus for Program Year #2 will formalized the WORTH Court Team thoughts into a protocol with practices. To ensure a quality product, WORTH Court will retain the consultant services of an entity with experience in sexual exploitation, trauma, human trafficking, and social norms.

**Reporting of Client/Consumer Responses:** The current WORTH Court data system can collect and track survivor/consumer data. In Program Year #1, we created this data set, without consultant services/help, in effort to report operational and demographic data. This data set forth a basis for our worth with survivors. We have now realized trends among our survivor consumers. As we move into Program Year #2, we will enhance this data set to meet the needs for a human trafficking diversion court system as we formalize the “best practices” to establish other courts in the State of North Carolina.

#### **5) Consultative assistance to establish a Stakeholder System Map that includes a Protocol for Evaluating “Safe” Service Providers.**

**Consultant Entity:** Consultant services were to be provided by NCCASA but no services were provided in Program Year #1. For Program Year #2, Judge King and the WORTH Court Team will contract with an outside non-affiliated entity to review and evaluate each service provider.

**Guidance Standards for Stakeholder System Map:** With no consultant services in Program Year #1, there was no Stakeholder System Map created for the WORTH Court by an external entity. Thus, by October 1, 2019 Judge King and the WORTH Court team created two Stakeholder System Maps. The first map detailed the flow of evaluation for a survivor once they have presented to WORTH Court to assess his/her needs and make recommendations for court consideration based on a Care Plan at the second court appearance. The second map detailed the intricate details of the Care Plan as a flow chart with the focused elements that need to be addressed or may need to be address for a survivor. Thus, with each element of the second flow chart the WORTH Court program has to have a service provider to meet the identified need(s) of the survivor. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will utilize the consultant time of a professional case management consultant with credentials in trauma, sexual assault, human trafficking, criminal justice, and clinical care to evaluate the WORTH Court Stakeholder System Map.

**Protocol for Evaluating SAFE Providers:** No consultant services were provided by NCCASA in Program Year #1. Thus, no evaluation method was developed for SAFE Providers. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will utilize the consultant time of a professional case management consultant with credentials in trauma, sexual assault, human trafficking, criminal justice, and clinical care to evaluate the WORTH Court Stakeholder System Map as it relates to the evaluation of SAFE Providers.

**Evaluation Tool:** No consultant services were provided by NCCASA in Program Year #1 and thus no evaluation tool was created. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will utilize the consultant time of a professional case management consultant with credentials in trauma, sexual assault, human trafficking, criminal justice, and clinical care to create an evaluation tool for SAFE providers.

**Evaluation Process:** No consultant services were provided by NCCASA in Program Year #1 and thus no evaluation process was created to be used with the evaluation tool. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will utilize the consultant time of a professional case management consultant with credentials in trauma, sexual assault, human trafficking, criminal justice, and clinical care to evaluate the WORTH Court Stakeholder System Map and develop and process to use the evaluation tool to evaluate the SAFE providers.

**Data Collection and Reporting:** For Program Year #2, Judge King and the WORTH Court Team will review month data as reported from our current data collection and reporting system for any Stakeholder System concerns. These may be identified as missed appointments, needs that are not being addressed in the care plan promptly, safety concerns, environmental or family dynamics, or life style transition challenges. Any "issue" will lead our WORTH Court Team to determine the need for added service providers, new and different providers, expanded services, and varying interventions. Data will give us information on the scope of court planning.

## **6) Consultative Assistance to support Judicial Leadership or other System Stakeholders in the Collaborative Process.**

**Consultant Entity:** Justice Matters or other entities were to be assigned training roles for court staff and modules/events never occurred in Program Year #1. National training options were offered to the funding entity, with a cross-walk of specific training elements beneficial to WORTH Court, and they were not approved. For, Program Year #2, WORTH Court has identified one or more national training programs onsite or via zoom that can enhance judicial skills for a human trafficking program.

**Technique & Tools for Collaboration:** These were not provided by the funding entity in Program Year #1 thru training by Justice Matters. WORTH Court proceeded on our own with the leadership of Judge Toni S. King and Chief Judge Robert Stiehl to identify specific techniques, processes, tools, scheduling, and staffing in collaboration with the local court system and our service providers to initiate a model court in Cumberland County. For Program Year #2, we will seek a review by an outside entity based in an academic setting with judicial insight and expertise for added perspectives on our initial model.

**Processes for Collaboration – Judicial Leadership:** No processes were offered by the funding entity to setup a model for a human trafficking court or technical assistance from Justice Matters as a consultant sub-recipient agency. WORTH Court proceeded with collaboration from other local/regional/state judicial judges thru discussion on how a human trafficking diversion court could interface within their existing system. First, what would be the major changes in their court system infrastructure. Secondly, what would be the staffing needs. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court would invite representatives from various North Carolina judicial districts to our juvenile and adult WORTH Court sessions to view our processes and give us feedback and recommendations. We will record their input and make it a part of our continuum of data.

**Techniques & Tools for Collaboration (if different):** No technical assistance provided in Program Year #1. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will utilize the judicial members of the WORTH Court Advisory Council Judicial Committee under the leadership of Retired Judge Elizabeth Keever to identify “Best Practices” techniques and tools. This Committee will be guided by the expertise of an external consultant from an academic institution with a background in human trafficking.

**Processes for Collaboration – System Stakeholders:** No training was offered or conducted on how to collaborate for process development to seek court system stakeholders during Program Year #1. WORTH Court did proceed independently between Judge King, Judge Stiehl, and Judge Pone to identify the essential judicial members who were essential to the success of the WORTH Court Advisory Council and its role in supporting a human trafficking diversion court in Cumberland County. For Program Year #2, our identified “Best Practices” will be reviewed by these Advisory Council stakeholders for input and insight and recommendations as part of our system recommendations to other courts for programmatic model development and implementation.

**Evaluation of Interventions & Results:** No template or sample was provided by the grant funded entity to evaluate the court based interventions, services, processes, and outcomes. In Program Year #1, WORTH Court thru our service provider network has tracked the judicial process survivor outcomes as reported by the providers in our data system. Updates are reviewed at each court staffing session. This evaluation process was created by Judge King without any process design by an external recommendation or entity and has proven successful for intervention and data documentation. This process and method will be enhanced as needed in Program Year #2 will evaluation occurring quarterly as data is reviewed for accuracy and additional information is needed on survivor outcomes. Our data set will be a part of the “Best Practices” provided to other North Carolina Court Systems for implementation of a model court.

**Data Collection and Reporting:** No format, template, or scope of work for reporting human trafficking court data was provided to WORTH Court in Program Year #1. This was requested on behalf of Judge King by the WORTH Court Coordinator on three occasions with no resulting response by the grant funded entity or allied consultants. Thus, WORTH Court proceeded to develop a format for data collection and reporting for Program Year #1 that at a minimum would comply with the quarterly NC Human Trafficking Commission reporting requirements. Additional data set elements were added that collected data on the quality of care being provided, maintenance of survivor counseling appointments, utilization of service providers, type of services being provided, demographics, and housing. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will evaluate the need to enhance our data collection and reporting process to include more elements that may be essential to support a diversion court like WORTH Court.

**7) A Research Design that anticipates Evidence Based Recommendations about Best Practices and Program Benefits to Survivors, the Court System, and Society writ large that will in turn establish a Baseline to Advocate for Broader Involvement of North Carolina Courts.**

**Evaluation of Programmatic Plan Progress (270 days):** No review by the funded entity. At the end of March 2020, WORTH Court under the direction of Judge King proceeded to compile an a preliminary “Best Practices” listing based on the WORTH Court Team documentation from juvenile and adult court sessions, case management activities, administration of the court, programmatic functions, and development of the diversion court. The “Best Practices” was compiled into the following categories: Administration, Case Management, Clinical Care, Judicial Processes, Strategic Planning for Programmatic Development, Fiscal Management, Judicial and Court Training, Community Awareness and Education, Victim or Survivor Assistance, Resource Development, Programmatic Operations, and Program Staffing. Each category has been closely reviewed by the WORTH Court Team as to what process worked well for us and what process needed improvement in our first 9 months of operation. For Program Year #2, WORTH Court will take make “Best Practices” as a priority to assist other North Carolina courts.

**Cumulative Data on Best Practices at 270 days:** No review by the funded entity.