A Method to Develop a Statewide Resource Guide, Needs Assessment, and Service Inventory to Respond to Human Trafficking

Andrea Nichols
Washington University in St. Louis, ajnichols@wustl.edu

Kathleen Preble
University of Missouri, Columbia, USA, preblek@missouri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity

Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

This Research and Scholarly Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dignity: A Journal of Analysis of Exploitation and Violence by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.
A Method to Develop a Statewide Resource Guide, Needs Assessment, and Service Inventory to Respond to Human Trafficking

Abstract
The extant research literature indicates that human trafficking survivors have a myriad of service needs, including acute and long-term needs. A statewide resource guide, needs assessment, and service inventory were developed for Missouri through community action research involving a partnership with an anti-trafficking coalition, a consortium of funders, and a series of small research teams. This article details the evolution of a resource guide and describes the methods used to 1) develop a statewide resource guide for human trafficking survivors and the service providers who work with them, 2) evaluate the resource guide, 3) create a statewide/regional service inventory based on resource guide data, and 4) conduct a statewide/regional needs assessment. The aim was to provide a scalable process that others can follow to develop their own statewide resource guides, service inventories, and needs assessments to assist survivors better and guide responses.

Keywords
Missouri, human trafficking, sex trafficking, labor trafficking, service inventory, resource guide, services, needs assessment

Creative Commons License
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License.

Acknowledgements
The authors thank the following people who were involved in the development of the resource guides: Heidi Volkl, Clementine Obama, Lauren Peffley, Kourtney Gilbert, Ellen Reed, Emi Wyland, Stephanie Hudson, Megan Owens, Eryn Carter, Hannah Langsam. Thanks to MCAHT for funding the development of these guides, and the Gephardt Institute for supporting a prior iteration of the St. Louis Metro guide. Thanks to the Missouri Foundation for Health for funding the dynamic upgrade to the Missouri Resource Guide and CARES for reformatting the guide, as well as the MU Extension faculty and individuals/organizations that reviewed and provided feedback. Thanks to CATE for providing feedback, updating, maintaining, and housing the guide. Thanks to the Sex Trafficking class of 2020 at Washington University in St. Louis for putting the PDF guides into excel format for CARES to work with. Thanks to Gabi Guzman, Jessica Almgren-Bell, Anjali Reddy, Emma Kelley, and Sophia Pintor for developing the service inventory spreadsheets. Thanks to Sophia Pintor for crosschecking data, developing service inventory charts, and reformatting charts. Thanks to Kathleen Preble and Ashley Cox for their work with the needs assessment survey, data and chart development. Thanks to Sarah Slutsker, Rose Sanders, Ellie Egbert, and Melissa Oberstadt for their work in developing the service inventory regional charts and service inventory reports. Dignity thanks the following reviewers for their time and expertise to comment on this article: Joan Reid, Associate Professor of Criminology and Director of the Trafficking in Persons Risk to Resilience Research Lab, University of South Florida, USA; and Jody Raphael, Senior Research Fellow Emerita, DePaul University School of Law, USA.

This research and scholarly article is available in Dignity: A Journal of Analysis of Exploitation and Violence: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity/vol7/iss3/4
A METHOD TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE RESOURCE GUIDE, NEEDS ASSESSMENT, AND SERVICE INVENTORY TO RESPOND TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Andrea Nichols  
*Washington University, St. Louis, USA*  
[0000-0002-9259-1375]

Kathleen Preble  
*University of Missouri, Columbia, USA*  
[0000-0003-3312-3843]

**ABSTRACT**

The extant research literature indicates that human trafficking survivors have a myriad of service needs, including acute and long-term needs. A statewide resource guide, needs assessment, and service inventory were developed for Missouri through community action research involving a partnership with an anti-trafficking coalition, a consortium of funders, and a series of small research teams. This article details the evolution of a resource guide and describes the methods used to 1) develop a statewide resource guide for human trafficking survivors and the service providers who work with them, 2) evaluate the resource guide, 3) create a statewide/regional service inventory based on resource guide data, and 4) conduct a statewide/regional needs assessment. The aim was to provide a scalable process that others can follow to develop their own statewide resource guides, service inventories, and needs assessments to assist survivors better and guide responses.
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**HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS** have diverse and varied healthcare, legal, and social service needs. Acute needs include access to food, shelter, clothing, water, transportation, crisis intervention, detox/substance use disorder services, safety planning, mental and physical healthcare, language access services, emergency medical care, and legal services/criminal justice assistance (Barnert et al., 2016; Koegler et al., 2020; Macy & Johns 2011; Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, & Cook-Heffron, 2014; Danis, Keisel-Caballero, & Johnson, 2019; Hardy, Compton, & McPhatter, 2013). Long-term needs include access to safe and affordable housing, transitional housing, ongoing physical and mental healthcare, language access services, legal services (such as immigration services, expungement, prosecution of the trafficker), substance use disorder services, assistance with GED or higher education access, career counseling, job skills/employment access assistance, and peer mentorship (Barnert et al., 2016; Koegler et al., 2020; Macy & Johns 2011; Busch-Armendariz, Nsonwu, & Cook-Heffron, 2014; Gerassi, 2018; Danis, Keisel-Caballero, & Johnson, 2019).

Although the needs of human trafficking survivors are well known, service providers report difficulty connecting survivors to such services (Gonzalez-Pons et al,
2020; Koegler et al., 2020). Lack of substance use disorder treatment and shelter availability pose barriers to service access (Gerassi, 2018; Danis, Keisel-Caballero, & Johnson, 2019). Eligibility requirements and service restrictions may also serve as barriers to accessing services (Gerassi & Howard, 2018). Service providers report a key benefit to coalition involvement is networking with other professionals and gaining knowledge of referral resources (Gerassi et al., 2017). Ostensibly, coalitions that can provide opportunities for networking and disseminating information about key resources commonly requested by human trafficking survivors are beneficial to the providers and the survivors they work with. This article details the evolution of a resource guide for human trafficking survivors based on the work of an anti-trafficking coalition and the methods they used to develop and evaluate it. The article also includes a description of developing a statewide service inventory based on resource guide data and a statewide needs assessment. The aim is to provide a scalable process that others can follow to develop their own statewide resource guides, service inventories, and needs assessments to assist survivors better and guide responses.

THE INITIAL GUIDE AND IDENTIFYING A COMMUNITY NEED

The aim of developing a state-level comprehensive resource guide was to assist human trafficking survivors and the service providers who worked with them in accessing key resources such as healthcare, criminal justice, and social services. The Coalition Against Trafficking and Exploitation (CATE), based in St. Louis, Missouri, had an existing resource guide for the St. Louis area that was developed in 2014. The author noted common concerns about the resource guide from long-standing coalition members in coalition meetings. The first guide included shelter and legal services in St. Louis City and St. Louis County. As the guide became dated, organizations were absent in the resource guide, and there were organizations in the guide that were no longer operational. Service providers also indicated that once they did a lot of work to find an organization to refer clients to, they sometimes found eligibility criteria in which a client was not able to access the service after all (restrictions may relate to substance use disorder, intellectual disability, mental illness, etc.), forcing them to renew their search for a resource or service. Accordingly, expanding the resource guide was needed to include the organizations’ service population, any restrictions, new organizations, and removing organizations that were no longer active. Coalition members indicated finding placements for clients was increasingly challenging, and knowledge about resources in neighboring counties was limited. In the St. Louis region, the resource environment had changed, and service providers were unclear about the services various organizations provided. Providers further indicated that making a comprehensive guide detailing the services offered would be a helpful expansion aiding their work with clients.

EXPANDING THE GUIDE TO THE ST. LOUIS METRO AREA

In 2018, the author worked with two graduate students. Each received a small change grant award of $250 from the Gephartd Institute at Washington University in St. Louis to add to the existing guide developed in 2014. In keeping with community action research methods (Ozanne & Anderson, 2010), the service areas included in the guide were expanded based on collaborative discussions in coalition meetings. Ten service areas were identified through these discussions and agreed upon for inclusion: substance use assistance, therapy/counseling, adult shelter, youth shelter, food pantries, 24-hour hotlines, language access services/translation, legal services, drop-in services, and employment services. These were the service areas coalition
members, who were primarily service providers, agreed should be included in the new iteration of the resource guide. The research team also expanded the guide to include five surrounding counties in the St. Louis Metro area to increase potential resource referrals in a landscape of resource scarcity.

EXPANDING THE GUIDE STATEWIDE

After the St. Louis guide was completed, a group of funders who had ties to the coalition expressed interest in expanding the resource guide to include the state of Missouri and the neighboring eight-county region of Illinois. A consortium of funders called the Missouri Collaborative Against Human Trafficking converged to request a three-pronged project to take place from Jan-Dec. 2019: 1) a statewide resource guide, 2) a needs, assessment, and demographic data report (Nichols, Preble & Cox, 2019, 2022; Preble, Nichols & Cox, 2020, 2022), and 3) a statewide strategic plan to address human trafficking (Preble, Nichols, and Owens, 2021). The present article focuses primarily on the first prong of the project, the statewide resource guide, and describes the methods used to develop it to provide a scalable process that anti-trafficking groups in other states could emulate to develop their own guides. The author and a small research team composed of social workers (including the two former graduate students who worked on the initial guide expansion), an attorney, a healthcare worker, and an undergraduate student undertook the resource guide development.

METHOD FOR DEVELOPING THE STATEWIDE RESOURCE GUIDE

To further develop the service areas, the lead researcher took a community action research approach and asked community partners and coalition members about additional service areas to include in the statewide resource guide. Discussions at coalition meetings and with key stakeholders, who held professionalized positions in legal, social, and healthcare services working with survivors of human trafficking and/or were survivors resulted in agreement on 12 service areas—the ten areas previously included with human trafficking prevention curriculum and human trafficking education and training added as a result of these conversations (see Appendix A). Once the 12 areas were agreed upon, the research team began to develop the statewide and Metro East resource guides. The research team was tasked with identifying the 12 resources in 114 counties and one independent city (N=115) in the state of Missouri, as well as eight Metro East St. Louis counties in Illinois. The research team met weekly to address any questions or challenges, share search tips, engage in camaraderie, and used the following structure:

- Each research team member was assigned a region and blocks of counties. The logic of this approach was that instead of randomly assigning counties or assigning them in alphabetical order, the research team member would become familiar with the service landscape of the region they were assigned to. The team member would also learn which organizations provided services to neighboring counties, thus reducing the likelihood of repeated calls and ultimately saving time. The research team member could simply enter the information from one call on multiple county guides in such cases. Within the first week of developing the guide, the research team found that because organizations sometimes service multiple counties, the team needed to include another line in the guide for each resource indicating the counties
served. This inclusion may be helpful for other organizations undertaking a similar project.

- The research team divided the one-year timeline into thirds, with six to eight county guides due from each of the five research assistants at the end of each four-month period.

- The research team engaged in three levels of research, with each research team member focused on one county in their assigned region at a time:

  - research organizations online by using the search engine google and using keywords for each resource (e.g., shelter, youth shelter, minor residential, homeless shelter, domestic violence shelter, trafficking shelter, drop-in center, drop-in services, drop-in care).

  - contact each organization to confirm information/ request information by phone or email to the director. Depending on the organization’s contact protocol, at times, questions were submitted via an online form. The information request/question content can be found in Appendix B.

  - “snowball” referrals by asking these initial contacts for additional referrals which may not have been uncovered in the original search (e.g., organizations without a web presence).

- The research team investigated each of the 12 service areas by county, gaining the following information:

  - populations served
  - eligibility requirements/ any restrictions
  - services offered
  - program/contact information of the organization (e.g., website, phone number, email/contact form link).

  - counties served/ service area

The research team found that sometimes the information presented by the organization depended on who answered the phone. For example, as there was some overlap, an organization serving multiple counties may have had multiple calls from researchers with different county allocations (e.g., counties they were assigned to research). This indicated that workers sometimes had different perceptions of their organizations’ services. In such cases, information was combined.

- A research team member regularly provided updates at coalition meetings about the progress of the guide and maintained momentum and interest in the resource guide project. It also allowed coalition members to ask questions and offer feedback.

The research team lead (the first author of this article) worked to uncover existing resource guides to cross-check with by soliciting them from community partners through the CATE coalition listserv and University of Missouri Columbia (MU) Extension faculty. Extension faculty are embedded in every region in the state to partner and establish relationships within the communities to meet education, resource, research, and other needs. In line with community action research, partnering with MU Extension faculty was a good way to get information and feedback on the newly
developed resource guides. The MU Extension faculty were contacted by an introduction through a community partner (the second author) who was part of waves two (needs assessment and demographic snapshot) and three (statewide strategic plan) of the larger research agenda described earlier. MU Extension had locations throughout the state (see Figure 1), and they were asked about any existing resource guides. The team lead developed a dropbox folder to collect any current guides. After collecting existing guides, the research team cross-checked existing guides provided by MU extension faculty with the guides created by the research team. This process revealed a high need statewide for this resource guide, as the resources on the guides we were referred to by extension faculty were dated, missing organizations, included organizations that were no longer active, and did not have complete information (e.g., service restrictions). Furthermore, many of the 12 resource areas were not included in the guides provided by MU Extension faculty. However, cross-checking the guides was important because it highlighted the need to create a sustainable living resource guide that coalition members could modify to address these issues as they arise over time (e.g., removing defunct organizations from the guide, providing an opportunity to update the information, adding new organizations, and also flagging problematic organizations for removal). This became a priority for the research team, and the process for doing so is detailed below. In addition to cross-checking the resource guides with county resource guides shared by MU extension, we cross-referenced information on United Way’s 2-1-1 website (n.d.), the MCADSV resource list (n.d.), the Missouri Department of Mental Health (n.d.), Missouri Lawyers Help (n.d.), Missouri Legal Services (2022), MoJobs (n.d.), Missouri Public Workforce System (n.d.) and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services (2022). Similarly, not all 12 resource areas were included, and/or information was incomplete or missing.

![Figure 1: University of Missouri Extension Faculty Regions](image)

Initially, the resource guides were formatted as separate county guides in PDF format with an interactive table of contents that would allow the user to “skip” to
that resource section of the guide. There were separate PDFs for each county, organized alphabetically and posted to the coalition website.

Notably, the services included in the guides served broader populations, and most were not trafficking-specific organizations. As such, we created a process for designating trafficking-specific organizations serving exclusively human trafficking survivors. These were initially identified with an asterisk on the guides, with instructions to use the “find” * feature to go directly to the trafficking-specific organizations. They will be labeled with a searchable badge (i.e., label) in the new interactive mapping format (detailed below). We also recommend organizations that receive human trafficking training receive a badge indicating their staff received human trafficking training.

We provided LGBTQ+ safe space designations on the St. Louis Metro area guides in partnership with a local organization suited for vetting the organizations. However, we did not expand this designation to other regions, as it was difficult to identify with any confidence a partner organization to assist with reliable vetting. We recommend providing LGBTQ+ safe space designations in counties where a reliable community partner can provide vetting.

QUALITY CONTROL AND VETTING ORGANIZATIONS

We aimed to address quality control through 1) the community feedback chain and 2) through MU extension faculty, who reviewed the guides. MU Extension faculty were asked to red flag any organizations that were problematic for removal or to identify any organizations we may have missed. Similarly, we solicited input within each region from community partners who worked directly with trafficking survivors, some of whom were also survivors. We asked them to review the guides in these regions, red flag any complex organizations (organizations identified as harming survivors) for removal and identify any organizations we missed. One organization was not included in the St. Louis resource guide, as it received multiple complaints. Complaints included that the organization’s director conducted human trafficking trainings in police departments that were sensationalistic and contained inaccurate information. Also, the director was known to parade survivors she came into contact with around the community, asking them to tell their stories to random community members. The director was viewed by multiple coalition members working in various sectors as uneducated in the area of human trafficking as well as ethical practices. Aside from this organization being dropped, there were no suggestions for change, indicating the research assistants were thorough in their work uncovering organizations in the 12 key resource areas and the method used was successful.

To add an additional layer of quality control, we requested community feedback with the rollout of the guides—with an email through various list serves asking for feedback, as follows:

When the guide is rolled out/ available on the CATE site, we request your feedback. The creators of the guides strived for accuracy in this material; however, if we missed you, and your organization would like to be part of the resource guide(s), or if you have information to add or change about a listing, information for updating can be sent to [director, CATE, email]. The lasting quality of this guide depends on the community. As time goes on, if your organization is no longer operational, or if your information changes, please contact [director, CATE, email] to update the guide. Similarly, if you
encounter a change as a service provider and have information to update
the guide, please be sure to share it with [director, CATE, email], who can
update the guides.

Furthermore, even with the multi-tier procedures to identify and remove com-
plex organizations (i.e., consulting with MU extension faculty, requesting community
feedback), we could not guarantee the quality of services each organization
provides. Thus, we requested ongoing feedback from community partners to identify
and remove problematic organizations from the guide, with the messaging on the
CATE website/guides as follows:

CATE cannot specifically endorse or validate organizations listed in the
county resource guides. Names, contact information and descriptions of
services are being provided for ease of identifying potential resources. If
you are aware of an organization that should not be included in the guide,
please contact CATE at [director email].

A limitation of the resource guide was that it relied on community feedback or/
MU extension faculty to red flag non-existent or problematic organizations. The pro-
cess for red flagging was informal and lacked specific criteria other than soliciting,
logging, and reviewing complaints. Because of this challenge, in 2022, CATE, the
statewide coalition, and a specialized workgroup developed criteria for minimum
standards of care (CATE, 2022) to disseminate to coalition members and maintained
responsibility for ongoing quality control. The workgroup explored minimum
standards of care related to trafficking and sought feedback from existing coalition
members and other survivor coalitions with established standards of care (e.g., Mis-
souri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence) to develop the published pro-
tocol released in March 2022. A description of how criteria for the standards of care
were established can be found in the Missouri Standards of Care (SOC): Guiding
Principles for Agencies Serving Survivors of Human Trafficking Wave One document
(CATE, 2022). As research consultants, we recommend establishing a protocol for
removing organizations from the resource guide or initially vetting them using de-
volved standards of care (as described in further detail below). Currently, the proto-
col is relatively informal and remains a limitation of the existing structure. Moreo-
ver, we recommend adding more details around establishing their criteria for stand-
ards of care as they are currently vague.

UPDATING THE RESOURCE GUIDE: INTERACTIVE INTERFACE
WITH MAPPING TECHNOLOGY

In 2021, the resource guide updated its formatting to include an interactive
mapping interface that could be used from a PC or cell phone (CATE, 2021). This re-
quired getting all of the data from the PDF guides into excel spreadsheets for ge-
ocoding. This was an enormous task undertaken by undergraduate student volun-
teers at Washington University in St. Louis in the spring semester of 2020, as the
plan to reformat the guide was present with the rollout of the PDF guides in January
2020. The excel spreadsheets were then provided to The Center for Applied Re-
search and Engagement Systems at the University of Missouri (MU CARES). MU
CARES utilizes geo-special technologies and meta-data analytic technics to map big
data to create reporting and collaboration tools to assist public and nonprofit organ-
izations in addressing community issues.
MU CARES worked to remove duplicate data from the excel spreadsheets (e.g., organizations serving multiple counties), combine spreadsheets, and add street addresses that were not included in all of the initial resource guides (confidential location organizations were geocoded to a PO Box or other proxy location). A programmer/analyst specialist from MU CARES geocoded the organization data provided in the excel spreadsheets. The updated guide now allows for an interactive mapping format with an interactive menu with search features and filtering capabilities. The newly formatted interactive resource guide also enables community members to enter feedback about flagging problematic organizations for removal, add organizations, revise organization details, or remove organizations no longer in operation through submission of an online form, to be reviewed by CATE members. Furthermore, the updated guide provides searchable “badges” indicating the kind of membership organizations have with CATE. Individuals and organizations seeking membership must agree, in part, to CATE’s standards of care, so the badges insinuate adherence to these standards.

The guide will be maintained over time by CATE to keep the guide up to date and make sure there are no missing organizations, inactive organizations, or missing information through a dedicated Americorps position, as well as continuous efforts toward community feedback at meetings and the email listserv asking community partners to check their organization’s information, and report organizations that are no longer operational, new organizations that should be included, or to red flag problematic organizations.

**EVALUATING THE RESOURCE GUIDE**

The first iteration of the statewide and Metro East Human Trafficking/Exploitation resource guide (e.g., the PDF County guides) was rolled out in January 2020 and evaluated in May/June 2021. A brief electronic Qualtrics survey with questions related to awareness, use, and effectiveness of the guides was developed by the research team lead and sent to community partners for review and feedback (see Appendix C). The finalized guide was disseminated to coalition members through the CATE listserv. The recruitment email was sent in mid-May, again with a reminder two weeks later and with the last call, two weeks following. Overall, the majority of survey respondents (N= 59) were aware of (71%, n=42) the resource guide, and those who were aware of the guide used it (86%, n=36) and found it effective (96%, n=25) in their work with clients. This indicates the guide largely met its intended purpose, to provide a resource guide to assist service providers in their work with human trafficking survivors.

The resource guide was reevaluated, in a post-test, following the shift to the new interactive interface with mapping/GIS capabilities in May-June 2022. It included the same questions as the first evaluation of the resource guide about awareness, use, and effectiveness but also included questions comparing the old PDF format to the new interactive GIS format (See Appendix D). Community partners reviewed the survey, revised accordingly, and disseminated to coalition members through the CATE listserv. Revisions were minor and limited to suggested changes in language (i.e., measuring use and effectiveness with clients and/or community partners) and question order. The first call for survey participation occurred at the end of May, and the last call for survey participation occurred in the second week of June. The first call also included a reminder that the resource guide had been updated to the new format and provided a link to the resource guide on the CATE website. Overall, in 2022, the vast majority of survey respondents (N=58) were aware of (75%, n=43)
and found the Human Trafficking/Exploitation Resource Guide useful (89%, n=38) and effective (97%, n=29) in their work with clients and community partners, with little change from 2021-2022. However, a majority of respondents (60%) indicated that they were unaware the resource guide was reformatted to include mapping technology and the interactive interface. Of respondents who had used the newly formatted resource guide, a majority (70%) found it easier to use than the old format in PDF version. Forty-seven percent of respondents found the newly formatted guide more effective in their work with clients and community partners, and 47% found the effectiveness to be about the same. Forty percent reported using the newly formatted guide more frequently than the PDF version of the guide, and 50% used it about the same.

Overall, it appears that the new format was beneficial in that those aware of the guide reported they used it more frequently, found it more effective in their work with clients, and indicated it was easier to use. However, better work to disseminate the newly formatted guide was needed, as a majority were unaware of the updated format. As such, we recommend others engaging in similar statewide efforts adopt the interactive mapping format from the beginning to save time and resources. Furthermore, we recommend developing a dissemination plan with community partners that is regionally and organizationally inclusive. Ideas for dissemination include discussing the resource guide at regional and state coalition meetings, as well as electronic dissemination through various listservs of organizations likely to come into contact with human trafficking survivors (e.g., state juvenile justice associations, domestic and sexual violence organizations, Department of behavioral health, etc.).

**METHOD FOR DEVELOPING THE SERVICE INVENTORY**

As a result of the resource guide development, very comprehensive data of services was available, providing a key opportunity to develop a comprehensive service inventory of the 12 services included in the resource guide. Quantifying the services/data in the county guides provided a highly accurate service inventory by county and region. All data from the guides were quantified in excel spreadsheets. A small research team of four did the work expressing counts of the guides in spreadsheet format in 2021. The process for developing the service inventory data was as follows:

- Research team members were assigned regions with counties to quantify, and the resource guides for the counties in their assigned regions were provided to them.

- For each of the counties in their assigned region, research team members were instructed to enter “counts” of each of the 12 services located in each county into a provided template (an excel doc with counties listed in the row heads and the 12 services listed in the column heads).

- One identified challenge was that there were resources in the county guides that may not be located in that county, but which served that county. Those were filtered out and excluded to avoid duplication in counts. Team members were instructed to include the resource in the county counts only if it was located in that county (gleaned from the line in the guide indicating located in x county but serves xx counties). For example, the shelters that serve statewide appeared in all the guides but were only counted in the...
county where they were located. Not filtering the actual location of the service would give the appearance of 123 shelters for a single shelter serving all counties in Missouri and the Bi-State area. Furthermore, duplication would “hide” issues with service access within a county by counting a service not located within that county and thus would not allow for within-region comparison of services (see Table 1).

As another layer of quality control, another research team member cross-checked all of the county data and was instructed to remove organizations not located within that county to avoid duplication of counts in 2021-22. She found that the work of the research assistants was thorough. The research team member also developed regional data tables in excel reflecting the service inventory data from the excel spreadsheets by county and regions (see Table 1 for an example).

Table 1: Regional Service Inventory by County: Metro East St. Louis Region in Illinois

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Shelters (adult)</th>
<th>Shelters/residential homes (Youth)</th>
<th>Legal services</th>
<th>Language access services</th>
<th>Drop-in centers</th>
<th>24-hour hotlines</th>
<th>Counseling and therapy</th>
<th>SUD services</th>
<th>Job services</th>
<th>Food pantries</th>
<th>HT education and training</th>
<th>HT prevention information</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macoupin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A research team of four and the team lead developed separate reports for each of the eight CATE regions (see Figure 2) and Metro East region.
The county-level service inventory provided information about access to services within regions and allowed for county-level comparison of service availability resulting in the identification of concentrated resources in counties within the region, as well as service deserts/ resource scarcity within other counties in the region (although population size is an important consideration). The service inventory included a table depicting all the counties within the assigned region and counts of the 12 services (e.g., Table 1 example) for each region. Research team members also combined data for all the counties in the regions they were assigned to and developed a bar chart depicting counts of resources within the region (See Figure 3 for an example). This allowed for an overall scope of available resources in the region and regional comparisons of service availability.

Figure 2: CATE Regional Map

Figure 3: Illinois Metro East Region, Regional Service Inventory
METHOD FOR DEVELOPING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A needs assessment was part of the second wave of the initial three-pronged project. Combining knowledge bases, the service inventory data, and the needs assessment data (e.g., what is needed + what is available) provided a better guide for recommendations for expanding services. Service inventories indicate what is available, but demand for services may exceed availability. Accurate recommendations for service gaps and needs can only be drawn when combined with needs assessment data. Thus, the needs assessment charts were also included in the reports, along with the service inventory data, along with comparative analyses.

While details of the needs assessment have been published elsewhere, see Preble et al. (2022), a brief description of the method is described here. The needs assessment methods involved disseminating a survey that measured respondents’ (service providers in social, legal, and healthcare sectors) perception of the level of need in their communities for 37 services on a five-point Likert scale, where five = very high and one = very low (see Appendix E). The electronic Qualtrics survey was administered through the statewide anti-trafficking coalition, CATE, and other anti-trafficking coalitions identified throughout the state uncovered through the resource guide development. Furthermore, other listservs and organizations known to serve human trafficking survivors were also included, such as the state juvenile justice association, Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, and purposively selected organizations from the service areas and regions uncovered in the resource guide data to gain regional and organization-type representation. Organizations were purposively selected for each of the 12 resource areas included in the guide within each of the eight CATE regions and the eight-county area of the Metro East/Illinois region. Finally, respondents were encouraged to forward the survey link to other organizations or individuals outside of the listserv who they knew to be involved in anti-trafficking efforts. We also asked participants to indicate the top three needs in their communities, which we sorted by region. The survey was completed by 107 research participants who reported working with 422 human trafficking survivors in the 12 months preceding the survey. A screening question included the legal definition of sex and labor trafficking provided in the U.S. TVPA and asked if participants worked with human trafficking survivors in the previous 12 months. Those responding negatively were exited from the survey. Data analysis involved calculating medians of the scaled responses for the 37 service needs on a state level, as well as for each of the CATE regions and Metro East St. Louis area in Illinois (see Table 2 for an example). Results can be found in Nichols, Preble, & Cox 2019 and Preble, Nichols & Cox, 2022.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Median Level of Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter for adults</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter for minors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General housing assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance/advocacy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental healthcare (counseling/therapy)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual healthcare</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in law enforcement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in the juvenile courts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary cross training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mentorship programs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training/employment assistance services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide human trafficking data collection tool</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally competent shelter for LGBTQ+ populations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical care (general)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in healthcare facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse (residential/detox)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse (outpatient)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex trafficking prevention programming</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner violence (IPV) services related to trafficking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/sexual assault service related to trafficking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in domestic violence/IPV services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training rape/sexual assault services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in children’s services residential facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency/crisis shelter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary team coordination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening tool to help identify trafficking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set of indicators (red flag signs) for preliminary identification</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide reporting protocol for human trafficking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security/food pantries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in centers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor trafficking prevention programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language access/interpretation translation services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMBINING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND SERVICE INVENTORY DATA

Separate service inventory and needs assessment reports for each of the CATE regions and Metro East St. Louis region were provided to CATE for dissemination to members. The regional reports included the service inventory table (see Table 1 for an example), service inventory chart combining county data into regional service inventory data (see Figure 3 for an example), and the needs assessment chart (see Figure 4 for an example), accompanied by a descriptive narrative highlighting key themes, and comparative analysis of the available services compared to identified needs.

Broadly, the service inventory indicated services were concentrated in areas with higher population density, and service deserts existed in less populous counties and regions. Yet, the level of need for services was high to very high for almost all services in all regions. Importantly, needs assessment data revealed that even when services appeared to be available and accessible, the demand for services frequently outweighed their availability. Thus, service inventory data alone may give the appearance of meeting a community need. Still, the needs assessment data reveals that service inventory data may disguise community need for various resources. For example, in the Metro East St. Louis region, all counties had substance use disorder-related services, including residential/detox and outpatient services. Yet, the needs assessment showed SUD-related services were reported as high-level needs, indicating that while services were available, they did not meet the need for such services. Future work should include a combination of service inventory and needs assessment data to inform funding streams. This way, gaps in services can be identified and enhanced by data indicating the level of need for various services.

CONCLUSION

The present article aimed to provide a method to develop a statewide human trafficking resource guide that is scalable to any site. Evaluation of the resource guide indicated it was widely used and found effective by service providers in their work with human trafficking survivors. Further evaluation of the second iteration of the resource guide indicates the interactive/mapping format is preferred by providers, who use it more frequently, find it easier to use, and more effective in their work with clients. The resource guide development also provided comprehensive data to develop a service inventory, with the methods provided in this article. Service inventories provide data that can identify service gaps, service deserts and can be developed into state-level, regional, or county-level reports. Any group engaged in developing a statewide resource guide may similarly develop service inventory data from the guides. Combining service inventory and needs assessment data is recommended to assist organizations seeking funding to expand services based on a combination of identified service gaps and needs. This article provides the needs assessment methodology and is scalable to any site as well. Developing regional reports of available services combined with assessing the salience of needs provides a helpful tool for advocacy for services and attention to service deficits.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the following people who were involved in the development of the resource guides: Heidi Volkl, Clementine Obama, Lauren Peffley, Kourtney Gilbert, Ellen Reed, Emi Wyland, Stephanie Hudson, Megan Owens, Eryn Carter, Hannah Langsam. Thanks to MCAHT for funding the development of these guides, and the Gephardt Institute for supporting a prior iteration of the St. Louis Metro guide. Thanks to the Missouri Foundation for Health for funding the dynamic upgrade to the Missouri Resource Guide and CARES for reformatting the guide, as well as the MU Extension faculty and individuals/organizations that reviewed and provided feedback. Thanks to CATE for providing feedback, updating, maintaining, and housing the guide. Thanks to the Sex Trafficking class of 2020 at Washington University in St. Louis for putting the PDF guides into excel format for CARES to work with. Thanks to Gabi Guzman, Jessica Almgren-Bell, Anjali Reddy, Emma Kelley, and Sophia Pintor for developing the service inventory spreadsheets. Thanks to Sophia Pintor for crosschecking data, developing service inventory charts, and reformatting charts. Thanks to Kathleen Preble and Ashley Cox for their work with the needs assessment survey, data and chart development. Thanks to Sarah Slutsker, Rose Sanders, Ellie Egbert, and Melissa Oberstadt for their work in developing the service inventory regional charts and service inventory reports. Dignity thanks the following reviewers for their time and expertise to comment on this article: Joan Reid, Associate Professor of Criminology and Director of the Trafficking in Persons Risk to Resilience Research Lab, University of South Florida, USA; and Jody Raphael, Senior Research Fellow Emerita, DePaul University School of Law, USA.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Andrea J. Nichols, Ph.D., is a Lecturer of Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies at Washington University in St. Louis and Professor of Sociology at St. Louis Community College Forest Park. Her practitioner-centered research examines victim advocacy and community-based responses, as well as social work and criminal justice practices with survivors. She regularly teaches the course “Sex Trafficking” and is the author and coauthor of numerous books and articles in the area of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation.

Kathleen Preble, Ph.D., MSW, is an Assistant Professor at the University of Missouri Columbia School of Social Work. Her areas of inquiry are human trafficking, sex work, and gender-based violence. Her research interests seek to increase our understanding of these complex phenomena leading to empowering prevention, intervention, and aftercare service delivery.

RECOMMENDED CITATION


REFERENCES


MCADSV. (n.d.). Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. [https://www.mocadsv.org/](https://www.mocadsv.org/)


MoJobs. (n.d.). Find a Missouri Job Center. [https://jobs.mo.gov/career-centers](https://jobs.mo.gov/career-centers)


United Way. (n.d.). 2-1-1. [https://www.211unitedway.org](https://www.211unitedway.org)
APPENDIX A

TWELVE RESOURCES INCLUDED IN THE STATEWIDE RESOURCE GUIDE AND SERVICE INVENTORY

- 1) Substance use assistance (outpatient and inpatient/detox)
- 2) Therapy/counseling
- 3) Adult shelter
- 4) Youth shelter
- 5) Food pantries
- 6) 24-hour hotlines
- 7) Language access services/translation
- 8) Legal services
- 9) Drop-in services
- 10) Employment services
- 11) Human trafficking prevention curriculum
- 12) Human trafficking education and training
APPENDIX B

RESOURCE GUIDE PHONE/EMAIL QUESTIONS

▪ 2) What are your eligibility requirements? Do you have any restrictions? Prompts: Medicaid eligible, Felony record, Active Substance Use Disorder, ID required.
▪ 3) What services does your organization offer?
▪ 4) We have the following program/contact information for your organization [Insert website, phone number, email/contact form link]. Is that correct?
▪ 5) What counties do you serve/ what is your service area?
▪ 6) Can you think of any organizations or contacts in your community that should be included in the resource guide?
▪ 7) Would you like a link to the resource guide sent to you when it is completed?
APPENDIX C

EVALUATING AWARENESS, USE, AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RESOURCE GUIDE

PART I

▪ 1) I am aware of the Missouri/Illinois Metro St. Louis Area Human Trafficking Resource Guide posted on the CATE website.
  o Yes (1)
  o No (2)

▪ 2) I have referred others to the human trafficking resource guide.
  o Yes (1)
  o No (2)

▪ 3) I have used the human trafficking resource guide in my work with clients.
  On a scale of 1-3, 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=frequently

▪ 4) The human trafficking resource guide was effective in my work with clients.
  On a scale of 1-3, 1=not effective, 2=moderately effective, 3=effective

▪ 5) Which region are you located in?
  o A. Central
  o B. Kansas City
  o C. Northeast
  o D. Northwest
  o E. Southeast
  o F. Southwest
  o G. St. Louis
  o H. Metro East

▪ 6) In an effort towards quality improvement, do you have any suggestions for improving the resource guide [Open Comment Box]
APPENDIX D

EVALUATING AWARENESS, USE, AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RESOURCE GUIDE PART II

1) I am aware of the Missouri/Illinois Metro St. Louis Area Human Trafficking Resource Guide posted on the CATE website.
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)

2) I have referred others to the human trafficking resource guide.
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)

3) I have used the human trafficking resource guide in my work with clients and/or community partners.
   On a scale of 1-3, 1= never, 2=sometimes, 3=frequently:

4) The human trafficking resource guide was effective in my work with clients, and/or community partners.
   On a scale of 1-3, 1= not effective, 2=moderately effective, 3=effective

5) The Missouri and Metro East Human Trafficking/Exploitation Resource Guide was updated from PDF county guides to a new format offering mapping and an interactive interface. I was aware that the Resource Guide was updated to this new format.
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2) (Skips to Q 10)

6) The Missouri and Metro East Human Trafficking/Exploitation Resource Guide was updated from PDF county guides to a new format offering mapping and an interactive interface. Have you used this newer format?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2) (Skips to Q 10)

7) I use the newly formatted guide more frequently than the old format.
   - Yes (1)
   - About the Same (2)
   - No (3)

8) The new format is easier to use than the old format.
   - Yes (1)
   - About the same (2)
   - No (3)

9) The new format is more effective in my work with clients and/or community partners than the new format.
   - Yes (1)
   - About the Same (2)
   - No (3)
10) Which region are you located in?
   - A. Central
   - B. Kansas City
   - C. Northeast
   - D. Northwest
   - E. Southeast
   - F. Southwest
   - G. St. Louis
   - H. Metro East

11) In an effort towards quality improvement, do you have any suggestions for improving the resource guide [Open Comment Box]
APPENDIX E

LIST OF SERVICE NEEDS

1. Shelter for adults
2. Shelter for minors
3. Transitional housing
4. General housing assistance
5. Culturally competent shelter for LGBTQ+ populations
6. Drop in centers
7. Legal assistance/advocacy
8. Medical care (general)
9. Mental healthcare
10. Sexual healthcare
11. Access to transportation
12. Training in law enforcement
13. Training in the juvenile courts
14. Training in schools
15. Training in healthcare facilities
16. Peer mentorship programs
17. Substance abuse (residential/detox)
18. Substance abuse (outpatient)
19. Sex trafficking prevention programming
20. Labor trafficking prevention programming
21. Intimate partner violence (IPV) services related to trafficking
22. Rape/sexual assault service related to trafficking
23. Training in domestic violence/IPV services
24. Training rape/sexual assault services
25. Training in children's services residential facilities
26. Job training/employment assistance services
27. Education assistance
28. Emergency/crisis shelter
29. Multidisciplinary team coordination
30. Statewide human trafficking data collection tool
31. Screening tool to help identify trafficking
32. Set of indicators (red flag signs) for preliminary identification
33. Statewide reporting protocol for human trafficking
34. Multidisciplinary cross training
35. Life skills assistance
36. Food security/food pantries
37. Language access/interpretation translation services