

**POLICY GOAL 6.4** State law mandates trafficking-specific training on victim-centered investigations and prosecutions for prosecutors.

State <sup>1</sup>	Does state law <i>mandate</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors? <sup>2</sup>	If not, does state law <i>authorize</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors? <sup>2</sup>
Alabama	No	No
Alaska	No	No
Arizona	No	Yes
Arkansas	No	Yes
California	No	Yes
Colorado	No	Yes; but contingent on funding
Connecticut	Yes	N/A
Delaware	No	Yes
District of Columbia	N/A <sup>3</sup>	N/A
Florida	Yes	N/A
Georgia	No	No
Hawaii	No	No
Idaho	No	No
Illinois	No	Yes
Indiana	No	No
Iowa	No	No
Kansas	No	No
Kentucky	Yes	N/A
Louisiana	No	No
Maine	No	No
Maryland	No	No
Massachusetts	No	No

<sup>1</sup> Evaluations of state laws are based on legislation enacted as of August 1, 2022. For more information on the importance of this policy goal, please visit <https://reportcards.sharedhope.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/2022-Issue-Briefs-6.4.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this chart, the term “authorize” encompasses state laws that mandate the *development* of trafficking-specific training, rather than the provision of training, and instances where an outside entity (e.g., a human trafficking task force) is required to provide training but prosecutors are not expressly mandated to receive the training.

<sup>3</sup> Policy goal not applicable based on District of Columbia’s status as a federal district under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Congress. In the District of Columbia, the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia (USAO) prosecutes trafficking offenses involving adult offenders. Because USAO is a federal entity, the District of Columbia cannot impose training mandates on USAO. Instead, training mandates would have to be imposed by Congress.

State <sup>1</sup>	Does state law <i>mandate</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors?	If not, does state law <i>authorize</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors? <sup>2</sup>
Michigan	No	Yes
Minnesota	No	Yes
Mississippi	No	No
Missouri	No	No
Montana	No	No
Nebraska	No <sup>4</sup>	No
Nevada	No	No
New Hampshire	No	No
New Jersey	No	Yes
New Mexico	No	Yes
New York	No	No
North Carolina	No	No
North Dakota	No	Yes; but establishment of the human trafficking commission, the entity responsible for conducting the training, is discretionary, making training contingent on its creation
Ohio	No <sup>5</sup>	No
Oklahoma	No	No
Oregon	No	No
Pennsylvania	No	No
Rhode Island	No	Yes
South Carolina	No	Yes
South Dakota	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	N/A
Texas	No	Yes
Utah	No	No
Vermont	No	No
Virginia	No <sup>6</sup>	No
Washington	No	Yes
West Virginia	No	No
Wisconsin	No	No
Wyoming	No	Yes

<sup>4</sup> While not statutorily mandated, Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 81-1431 (Training regarding issues in human trafficking; task force; duties) does clarify the legislature’s intent that trafficking-specific training be provided.

<sup>5</sup> While not statutorily mandated, Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 4743.07 (Licensing condition – Training in the recognition and handling of human trafficking) does clarify the legislature’s intent that trafficking-specific training be provided.

<sup>6</sup> Although training is not statutorily mandated, Va. Code Ann. § 9.1-102 (Powers and duties of the Board and the Department) does allow the Attorney General to advise prosecutors on trafficking-related prosecutions.

State <sup>1</sup>	Does state law <i>mandate</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors?	If not, does state law <i>authorize</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors? <sup>2</sup>
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>4 states</b> statutorily <i>mandate</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors.	<b>16 other states</b> statutorily <i>authorize</i> trafficking-specific training for prosecutors.