



NATIONAL ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES ASSOCIATION

SUMMARY REPORT

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES PROGRAMS STATE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

Survey conducted and report written by the

National Adult Protective Services Association (NAPSA)

Joanne M. Otto and Kathleen M. Quinn

November, 2007

A Product of the National Center on Elder Abuse

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES PROGRAMS

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

SUMMARY REPORT ON A 2002 SURVEY

A Product of the National Center on Elder Abuse

**Survey conducted and report written by the
NATIONAL ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES ASSOCIATION**

Joanne M. Otto and Kathleen M. Quinn

November, 2007

This report was supported by a grant No. 90-AP-2144 from the Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Grantees undertaking projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their findings and conclusions. Therefore, points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official Administration on Aging policy.

National Center on Elder Abuse

The National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) serves as a national resource for elder rights advocates, law enforcement and legal professionals, public policy leaders, researchers, and citizens. It is the mission of NCEA to promote understanding, knowledge sharing, and action on elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

The NCEA is administered under the auspices of the National Association of State Units on Aging and has the following partner agencies.

National Center on Elder Abuse Partners

Sara Aravanis, NCEA Director
Associate Director for Elder Rights
National Association of State Units on Aging
1201 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC
202-898-2586 / Fax 202-898-2538
E-mail: saravanis@nasua.org
Web: www.elderabusecenter.org

Kathleen M. Quinn, Director
National Adult Protective Services
Association (NAPSA)
920 S. Spring Street Suite 1200
Springfield, IL 62704
217-523-4431 / Fax 217-524-6650
E-mail: kathleen.quinn@apsnetwork.org
Web: www.apsnetwork.org

Lori A. Stiegel, Associate Staff Director
American Bar Association (ABA)
Commission
on Law and Aging
740 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005-
1009
202-662-8692 / Fax 202-662-8698
E-mail: lstiegel@staff.abanet.org
Web: www.abanet.org/aging

Randy Thomas, President
National Committee for the Prevention of
Elder Abuse (NCPEA)
1612 K Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington,
DC 20006
202-682-4140 / Fax 202-223-2099
E-mail: ncpea@verizon.net
Web: www.preventelderabuse.org

Karen Stein, Director
Clearinghouse on Abuse and
Neglect of the Elderly (CANE)
School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-3525 / Fax 302-831-3587
E-mail: kstein@udel.edu
Web:
<http://db.rdms.udel.edu:8080/CANE/index.jsp>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Adult Protective Services Association (NAPSA), through the National Center on Elder Abuse, conducted a survey of all 50 states, the District of Columbia and Guam in 2002 to determine the administrative structure of each state's Adult Protective Services Program (APS). In 2007, a brief follow-up survey was sent to the same distribution list to find out if the APS Program had been transferred from one state agency to another in the intervening timeframe.

The compiled results of this survey in this report, although from 2002, constitute the most thorough examination of APS Programs in existence. Because APS provides the direct services to victims of elder abuse and abuse of adults with disabilities, it is critical to understand how they operate, how they are structured and to what degree they are funded.

Forty two states, the District of Columbia, and Guam all responded to at least some of the initial survey questions. Some of the survey's highlights include:

- Five (13.5%) of 37 states responding could not provide their state's funding level for APS;
- California's APS budget represented 25% of all APS funding nationwide, which was just under \$400 million for the country; the spending by the top three states, California, New York and Georgia, amounted to 54% of total APS funding.
- Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) funds, which are federal funds disbursed to states to fund social programs according to the state's priorities, are utilized by 15 states for APS and represented over one quarter of all funding on APS, or just over \$100 million. New York's SSBG allocation to APS accounted for almost half of that total, and New York together with Texas represented over two thirds.
- The Older Americans Act (OAA) represents an insignificant source of APS funding, accounting for just .25% (one quarter of 1%) of the total. Only ten states allocate any OAA funds for APS.
- States provide the majority of funds for protective services to vulnerable adults, appropriating over \$210 million or 53% at the time of this survey. In nine of the twenty nine states (31%) reporting, state funds accounted for 90 – 100% of all APS funding.
- In 2002, fifteen of the thirty five states reported their APS Program was located within the State Unit on Aging (SUA), and over half reported it was in a human/social services agency outside the SUA. Thirty states responded to the follow-up survey in 2007. Of those, eleven were in human/social service agencies and nineteen were in their State Unit on Aging. Of those, seven had been transferred within the past few years.
- APS staffing levels and configurations vary greatly across states, depending not only on the level of funding but also whether direct client services are provided by personnel of the state, counties, Area Agencies on Aging and/or other local not for profit entities.

Adult Protective Services are the necessary, life saving link to abuse victims who are older and/or are adults with disabilities. This report serves as a baseline description of APS Programs across the country, but more and more recent research is needed in order to assess the adequacy of protective services for these vulnerable adults.

INTRODUCTION

The direct victims' services system for elder abuse is Adult Protective Services (APS). Suspected cases of elder abuse are reported to, and investigated by, APS Programs in each state. APS intervenes to protect the older victims of abuse, neglect and exploitation and to ensure that they receive the care and services they need. In addition to responding to older victims, in most states APS Programs also investigate reports of abuse, neglect and exploitation of younger adults with disabilities.

Because APS is the direct link to elder abuse victims, it is important for the elder abuse field to understand how APS Programs are organized, funded and administered. The National Center on Elder Abuse commissioned the survey described in this report in order to further a victim-centered approach to elder abuse. The findings represent a useful starting place to identify gaps in elder protective services and to track changes to APS throughout the nation over time.

In part because there is no federal APS statute or funding stream, over the years each state has:

- developed its own laws, which vary considerably from state to state in terms of the definitions used, the persons protected and the services provided;
- provided its own state funds or allocated a small part of its federal Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) funds for APS, and
- adopted its own organizational structure to administer the program, which also varies considerably among different states.

These variations make it very difficult to collect consistent data across states, and they also complicate efforts to create standardized training and public awareness programs across the country.

In order to further the understanding of APS services throughout the nation, the National Adult Protective Services Association (NAPSA) surveyed the states, the District of Columbia and Guam about each state's administrative structure in 2002. In the spring of 2007, a survey update was distributed to determine which APS programs had moved from one agency to another within their state government structure, and to find out at what level direct client services are provided in each state (e.g. state or county).

This report provides a descriptive summary of how APS services are organized by state throughout the country. The data reflected are FY 2003 unless otherwise indicated.

METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) was developed in 2001 by NAPSA staff and sent to all the NAPSA Board members and NCEA partners for their comments. After receiving many comments, extensive revisions were made to the original. On March 29, 2002, a letter and copy of the survey were sent to all fifty state APS programs, the District of Columbia and Guam, requesting their participation. In the cover letter, the states were told that "The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive, nation-wide overview of Adult Protective Services which will be used to make best practice and policy recommendations at the state and national levels." Forty-two states and the District of Columbia Guam responded. Follow-up emails and calls were made to encourage as much participation as possible.

Information from the surveys was entered onto an Excel spreadsheet. Many states were unable to provide all of the information requested, due to gaps in their data management systems. Nonetheless, the amount of data collected was staggering. The data was reviewed, and the most useful and complete information was included in this final report. In 2007, a brief follow-up survey (Appendix B) was distributed to the same list and the results from it were also included in this report.

For those states with bifurcated APS systems, this report uses "EPS" or Elder Protective Services to connote the program which serves older persons, and "APS" to designate the program serving younger adults with disabilities.

A. FUNDING

A.1 APS Funding Levels

Thirty seven states responded to the question about funding for APS services in their state. Five of those responded by stating that the information requested was not available. New Hampshire reported, "There is no specific funding allocated to Adult Protective Services."

Of the thirty two states that did have data on APS funding, the amounts ranged from a low of \$106,478 in Wyoming to a high of \$98,746,173 in California, with an average of \$12,404,245 among the 32 states responding. Because large states such as California, New York (\$57,198,000) and Texas (\$36,390,175) skew the mean upward, it is useful to observe that the median amount per reporting state for the provision of APS services was just \$3,115,200.

NOTE: Several states, including Illinois, Louisiana, Oregon, and Massachusetts, have two APS Programs, one serving older persons and the other serving younger adults with disabilities, and Pennsylvania has one program serving older persons only. Where data for both programs were provided, the acronyms EPS is used for Elder Protective Services and APS for Adult Protective Services. If only one response is included, it is identified as APS or EPS.

A.1. *What was the total APS Program funding allocation for your state during the most recent reporting year?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	37	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS,¹ Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

► Information Not Available:	5	13.5%
-------------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES ► • Delaware, Iowa, Michigan, New Hampshire, South Dakota

NOTES ► • New Hampshire: "There is no specific funding allocated to Adult Protective Services."

► Total APS Funding Allocation Reported:	32	86.5%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Mississippi, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ►

- Hawaii "Personnel funds not available. Funds for payment of services only."
- Kansas "FY 2002 = \$379,274. Excludes staffing and other costs."
- Maine "Supplied by Karen Elliott, Director of Regional Operations."
- Ohio "State Fiscal Year 2002 (7/1/01 - 6/30/02)."
- Vermont "SFY – 2002."

DATA SNAPSHOT ►

Number of States Reporting Data	32 (86.5%)	
Total APS Funding Allocation Reported:	\$396,885,834	
Average Amount Per Reporting State:	\$12,404,245	
States Above Average/Range High	8 25%	High: \$98,746,173 (California)
States Below Average/Range Low	24 75%	Low: \$106,478 (Wyoming)

¹ Several states, including Illinois, Louisiana, Oregon, and Massachusetts, have two APS programs, one serving older persons and one serving younger adults with disabilities. Where data for both programs were provided, the acronyms EPS for Elder Protective Services and APS for Adult Protective Services are used. If only one response from a bifurcated state is included, it refers to the program serving older persons unless otherwise indicated.

A.1 FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE

STATE	TOTAL APS FUNDING	% of Total Spending by STATE	\$ per State Population	STATE	RANK Total Spending	STATE	RANK Per Cap. Spending
Alabama	\$13,199,652	3.33%	\$2.90	California	1	Kentucky	1
Alaska	\$3,053,400	0.77%	\$4.56	Georgia	2	Georgia	2
Arizona	\$3,400,000	0.86%	\$.55	New York	3	Alaska	3
Arkansas	\$1,184,787	0.30%	\$.42	Texas	4	South Carolina	4
California	\$98,746,173	24.88%	\$2.71	Kentucky	5	DC	5
DC	\$1,794,304	0.45%	\$3.09	Florida	6	Maine	6
Florida	\$25,125,286	6.33%	\$1.39	South Carolina	7	New York	7
Georgia	\$57,266,745	14.43%	\$6.12	Alabama	8	Alabama	8
Hawaii	\$116,581	0.03%	\$.09	Illinois EPS	9	California	9
Idaho	\$920,000	0.23%	\$.63	Oklahoma	10	Oklahoma	10
Illinois EPS	\$7,588,069	1.91%	\$.59	Pennsylvania EPS	11	Texas	11
Kansas	\$379,274	0.10%	\$.14	Tennessee	12	Florida	12
Kentucky	\$32,068,500	8.08%	\$7.46	Maryland	13	Utah	13
Louisiana	\$2,002,961	0.50%	\$.47	Maine	14	Maryland	14
Maine	\$4,011,176	1.01%	\$3.04	Arizona	15	Tennessee	15
Maryland	\$5,502,771	1.39%	\$.31	Utah	16	Oregon EPS and APS	16
Massachusetts APS	\$1,993,889	0.50%	\$.31	Alaska	17	Vermont	17
Mississippi	\$190,922	0.05%	\$.07	Ohio	18	Idaho	18
New York	\$57,198,000	14.41%	\$2.96	Oregon EPS and APS	19	Illinois EPS	19
North Dakota	\$236,110	0.06%	\$.37	Louisiana	20	Arizona	20
Ohio	\$2,928,437	0.74%	\$.26	Massachusetts APS	21	Pennsylvania EPS	21
Oklahoma	\$7,334,994	1.85%	\$2.05	DC	22	Rhode Island	22
Oregon EPS and APS	\$2,750,000	0.69%	\$.74	Arkansas	23	Louisiana	22
Pennsylvania EPS	\$5,793,947	1.46%	\$.47	Virginia	24	Arkansas	23
Rhode Island	\$491,605	0.12%	\$.46	Idaho	25	North Dakota	24
South Carolina	\$14,800,000	3.73%	\$3.42	Rhode Island	26	Massachusetts APS	25
Tennessee	\$5,759,500	1.45%	\$.95	Vermont	27	Ohio	26
Texas	\$36,390,175	9.17%	\$1.55	Kansas	28	Wyoming	27
Utah	\$3,177,000	0.80%	\$1.25	North Dakota	29	Kansas	28
Vermont	\$425,098	0.11%	\$.68	Mississippi	30	Virginia	29
Virginia	\$1,000,000	0.25%	\$.13	Hawaii	31	Hawaii	30
Wyoming	\$106,478	0.03%	\$.21	Wyoming	32	Mississippi	31
TOTAL	\$396,885,834.00	100%	\$1.81				

A.2 Sources of APS Funding

Thirty six states responded to the question about the sources of funds for their APS programs.

A.2. Please provide funding allocation sources and amounts below.

N = Total Number of Responses:	36	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

►A.2.a. Information Not Available:	2	100.0%
---	----------	---------------

STATES ► New Hampshire, South Dakota

A.2.b. Social Services Block Grant Funds²

Of the 36 states which reported on the sources of their funding for APS, fifteen (15) utilize SSBG monies. The total amount of SSBG allocated to APS by those states was \$104,486,555, which represents 26.3% of all the APS funds reported by all the responding states.

New York State, however, accounted for almost half of all the SSBG funds utilized, with an SSBG allocation of \$51,012,000. Texas also designates a substantial amount of SSBG funds to APS: \$21,923,434. These two states account for over two thirds of all SSBG funds utilized for APS. The remaining thirteen (13) reporting states had an average SSBG allocation of \$2,427,009. Nationally, about 6% of SSBG dollars are used for APS.

A.2.b. Social Services Block Grant:	15	100.0%
--	-----------	---------------

STATES ► Arizona, DC, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah.

DATA SNAPSHOT ►

Number of States Reporting SSBG Funding Data	15 (25.3%)
Total SSBG Funding:	\$104,486,555
% of SSBG Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	26.33%
Rank of SSBG Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	1
Average Amount SSBG Funding Per Reporting State:	\$6,965,770
States Above Average/Range High	\$190,922 (Mississippi)
States Below Average/Range Low	\$51,012,000 (New York)

SUMMARY TABLE ► Funding from SOCIAL SERVICE BLOCK GRANTS

SUMMARY TABLE KEY

STATE =	Name of state reporting funding from this funding source.
SSBG AMOUNT =	Total amount received by a specific state from this funding source.
% (1) =	Percentage of Total Amount for this funding source received by a specific state compared to all states receiving funding from this source.
RANK (1) =	Rank of state for this funding source compared to other states reporting this type of funding.
TOTAL APS FUNDING % (2) =	State's Total APS Funding Allocation as reported in Question 1.A.
FUNDING % (2) =	% represented by this funding source of a state's TOTAL APS FUNDING ALLOCATION
RANK (2) =	Rank of state

² For updated information on SSBG expenditures, see Social Services Block Grant Program Annual Report FY 2005, the most recent report found on the HHS website, at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/annrpt/2005/index.html>.

STATE	AMOUNT	% (1)	RANK (1)	TOTAL APS FUNDING	% (2)	RANK (2)
Arizona	\$1,400,000	1.3%	10	\$3,400,000	41.2%	10
DC	\$1,794,304	1.7%	9	\$1,794,304	100%	1
Florida	\$4,293,575	4.1%	6	\$25,125,286	17.1%	12
Kansas	\$164,062	0.7%	14	\$379,274	43.3%	8
Kentucky	\$5,063,200	4.9%	5	\$32,068,500	15.8%	13
Maryland	\$2,196,179	2.1%	8	\$5,502,771	39.9%	11
Michigan	\$600,000	0.6%	10	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	\$190,922	0.2%	13	\$190,922	100%	1
New York	\$51,012,000	48.8%	1	\$57,198,000	89.2%	3
Oklahoma	\$5,800,000	5.6%	4	\$7,334,994	79.1%	4
Rhode Island	\$349,079	0.3%	11	\$491,605	71.0%	5
South Carolina	\$6,225,000	6.0%	3	\$14,800,000	42.1%	9
Tennessee	\$3,199,800	3.1%	7	\$5,759,500	55.6%	7
Texas	\$21,923,434	21.0%	2	\$36,390,175	60.3%	6
Utah	\$275,000	0.3%	12	\$3,177,000	8.7%	14

A.2.c. Older Americans Act (OAA) Funding

Only ten states responded that they use any OAA funds for APS. OAA dollars represent just 0.25% (one-quarter of one percent) of all APS funds, and the total OAA funding for APS in all the reporting states is under a million dollars (\$998,265). Three of the reporting states account for 61% of the OAA dollars allocated to APS: Pennsylvania EPS, with \$160,400, Illinois EPS, at \$212,269, and North Dakota at \$236,110, which represents that state's entire APS program budget.

▶ A.2.c. Older Americans Act:	10	100.0%
-------------------------------	----	--------

STATES ▶ Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Maine, North Dakota, Oregon EPS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island

NOTES ▶

- Kentucky "Different cabinet agency (Health Services)."
- Maine "Targeted case management."

DATA SNAPSHOT ▶

Number of States Reporting OAA Funding Data	10
Total OAA Funding:	\$998,265
% of OAA Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	.25%
Rank of OAA Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	2
Average Amount OAA Funding Per Reporting State:	\$99,827
Range:	LOW: \$25,300 (Alaska) HIGH: \$236,110 (North Dakota)

SUMMARY TABLE ▶ The following Summary Table refers Older Americans Act funding.

SUMMARY TABLE KEY

STATE =	Name of state reporting funding from this funding source.
SSBG AMOUNT =	Total amount received by a specific state from this funding source.
% (1) =	Percentage of Total Amount for this funding source received by a specific state compared to all states receiving funding from this source.
RANK (1) =	Rank of state for this funding source compared to other states reporting this type of funding.
TOTAL APS FUNDING =	State's Total APS Funding Allocation as reported in Question 1.A.
FUNDING % (2) =	% represented by this funding source of a state's TOTAL APS FUNDING ALLOCATION
RANK (2) =	Rank of state

STATE	OAA AMOUNT	% (1)	RANK (1)	TOTAL APS FUNDING	% (2)	RANK (2)
Alaska	\$25,300	2.5%	9	\$3,053,400	0.8%	8
Arkansas	\$47,000	4.7%	7	\$1,184,787	4.0%	5
Delaware	\$46,000	4.6%	8	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	\$55,000	5.5%	5	\$920,000	6.0%	4
Illinois EPS	\$212,269	21.3%	2	\$7,588,069	2.8%	6
Maine	\$23,660	2.4%	10	\$4,011,176	0.6%	9
North Dakota	\$236,110	23.7%	1	\$236,110	100%	1
Oregon EPS	\$50,000	5.0%	6	\$50,000	100%	1
Pennsylvania EPS	\$160,400	16.1%	3	\$5,793,947	2.8%	7
Rhode Island	\$142,526	14.3%	4	\$491,605	29.0%	3
TOTAL	\$998,265	100%		\$23,329,094	4.2%	

A.2.d. State Funds

State appropriated funds make up over half of all monies used to provide APS. At the time of the 2004 survey, total state funding amounted to \$210,035,375, or 53% of all funding available. According to the twenty nine states on which state funding data were reported, the average amount per state was \$7,242,599 and the median amount was \$2,808,210. The range was from a high of \$67,458,000 in California, to a low of \$21,000 in Delaware. Other states which invest significant amounts of their own monies in APS include Alabama, at \$12,173,514, Georgia, at \$42,374,504 and Kentucky, at \$16,836,400.

In four reporting states, Hawaii, Louisiana, Vermont and Wyoming, state funds account for 100% of APS resources, and five other states use state dollars for over 90% of APS funding. Those are Alaska, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Pennsylvania EPS, and Utah.

► A.2.d. State Funds:

30

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS, Pennsylvania EPS, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

DATA SNAPSHOT ►

Number of States Reporting State Funds Funding Data	30
Total State Fund Funding:	\$210,035,375
% of OAA Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	.25%
Rank of OAA Funding as a source of Total APS Funding:	2
Average Amount OAA Funding Per Reporting State:	\$7,001,179
Range:	LOW: \$25,300 (Alaska)
	HIGH: \$236,110 (North Dakota)

SUMMARY TABLE ► The following Summary Table refers State Funds for APS.

SUMMARY TABLE KEY

STATE =	Name of state reporting funding from this funding source.
SSBG AMOUNT =	Total amount received by a specific state from this funding source.
% (1) =	Percentage of Total Amount for this funding source received by a specific state compared to all states receiving funding from this source.
RANK (1) =	Rank of state for this funding source compared to other states reporting this type of funding.
TOTAL APS FUNDING % (2) =	State's Total APS Funding Allocation as reported in Question 1.A.
RANK (2) =	% represented by this funding source of a state's TOTAL APS FUNDING ALLOCATION
	Rank of state

STATE	STATE FUNDS AMOUNT	% (1)	RANK (1)	TOTAL APS FUNDING	% (2)	RANK (2)
Alabama	\$ 12,173,514	5.8%	5	\$14,501,464	84.0%	13
Alaska	\$ 2,922,400	1.4%	13	\$3,053,400	95.7%	7
Arizona	\$ 3,000,000	1.4%	12	\$4,400,000	68.2%	18
Arkansas	\$ 853,341	0.4%	22	\$1,187,287	71.9%	16
California	\$ 67,458,000	32.1%	1	\$98,746,173	68.3%	17
Delaware	\$ 21,000	0.01%	29	\$67,000	31.3%	24
Florida	\$ 16,416,788	7.8%	4	\$25,125,826	65.3%	19
Georgia	\$ 42,374,504	20.2%	2	\$57,266,745	74.0%	15
Hawaii	\$ 116,581	0.1%	27	\$116,581	100%	1
Idaho	\$ 865,000	0.4%	21	\$920,000	94.0%	9
Illinois EPS	\$ 7,375,800	3.5%	6	\$7,588,069	97.2%	5
Kansas	\$ 215,212	0.1%	26	\$379,274	56.8%	20
Kentucky	\$ 16,836,400	8.0%	3	\$31,068,500	54.2%	21
Louisiana	\$ 2,002,961	1.0%	16	\$2,002,961	100%	1
Maine	\$ 3,500,000	1.7%	10	\$4,011,176	87.3%	11
Maryland	\$ 1,762,632	0.8%	17	\$5,502,771	32.0%	23
Massachusetts APS	\$ 1,717,026	0.8%	18	\$1,993,889	86.1%	12
New York	\$ 3,093,000	1.5%	11	\$57,198,000	5.4%	29
Ohio	\$ 2,808,210	1.3%	15	\$2,928,437	95.9%	6
Oklahoma	\$ 1,365,503	0.7%	19	\$7,334,994	18.6%	27
Oregon EPS	\$ 1,280,000	0.6%	20	\$2,700,000	47.4%	22
Pennsylvania EPS	\$ 5,484,852	2.6%	8	\$5,793,947	94.7%	8
South Carolina	\$ 4,067,900	1.9%	9	\$14,800,000	27.5%	25
Tennessee	\$ 741,100	0.4%	24	\$5,759,500	12.9%	28
Texas	\$ 7,350,075	3.5%	7	\$6,390,175	20.2%	26
Utah	\$ 2,902,000	1.4%	14	\$3,177,000	91.3%	10
Vermont	\$ 425,098	0.2%	25	\$425,098	100%	1
Virginia	\$ 800,000	0.4%	23	\$1,000,000	80.0%	14
Wyoming	\$ 106,478	0.1%	28	\$106,478	100%	1

A.2.A. Since 2000 have SSBG funds for APS in your state been reduced?

N = Total Number of Responses: 31 83.8%

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ► ● Virginia "SSBG funds have been decreased but the agency has not reduced APS."

NOT REPORTING ► Arkansas, DC, Hawaii, Illinois EPS, Louisiana, Ohio, Vermont,

NOTES ► ● Hawaii "N/A - SSBG funds not used for APS."
● Ohio "N/A - There is no SSBG Set-aside funding for APS."

► Information Not Available 12 38.2%

STATES ► California, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, South Carolina, South Dakota.

▶ Yes:	7	22.6%
--------	---	-------

STATES ▶ Alabama, Florida, New York, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ▶

- Alabama "But not used for APS."

▶ No:	12	38.2%
-------	----	-------

STATES ▶ Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, North Dakota, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, Tennessee.

NOTES ▶

- Delaware "Don't receive this type of funding."
- North Dakota "No SSBG funds at all."
- Pennsylvania EPS "Don't get SSBG Funds."
- Rhode Island "Not yet."
- Tennessee "Not for APS specifically."

A.2.B. Effects of Reduction in SSBG Funding

Seven states reported reductions in FY 2003 SSBG funding for APS, ranging in amounts from \$177,000 (Utah) to \$2,900,000 in Texas.

A.2.B. *If yes, what was the total amount of APS SSBG funds lost?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	7	100.0%
--------------------------------	---	--------

STATES ▶ Alabama, Florida, New York, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

▶ Information Not Available:	3	42.9%
------------------------------	---	-------

STATES ▶ Alabama, New York, Virginia.

NOTES ▶

- New York "8% reduction in total SSBG."
- Kansas "Reports may be screened out and not investigated."
- South Carolina "We had to transfer 34 workers to other programs . . . we lost a lot of expertise and this sent the message that APS was not important. In some areas APS is now being handled by CPS workers and supervisors."
- Tennessee "Reductions in support services such as homemaker services, etc. Impair the ability of the APS program to most effectively reduce risks to victims."

▶ APS SSBG Funds Lost with Amount Provided:	4	57.1%
---	---	-------

STATES ▶ Florida, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

SUMMARY TABLE ▶

STATE	APS SSBG FUNDS LOST AMOUNT	%	RANK
Florida	\$601,203	14.92%	2
Texas	\$2,900,000	71.99%	1
Utah	\$177,000	4.39%	4
Wyoming	\$350,000	8.69%	3
TOTAL	\$4,028,203	100%	

A.2.B. *If yes, please describe the impact of this reduction on services to clients.*

Responses from states answering YES in question A.2.A.

- Alabama NO RESPONSE
- Florida "This loss of funds was offset by an increase in funding from other sources."
- New York "Local and state funding had to make up the difference in lost federal dollars."
- Texas "The state transferred other funds into APS to make up for the loss, so there was no impact; e.g. crime victims compensation."
- Utah "Adult Foster Care and Adult Day Care Services to victims of abuse and neglect has been reduced by approximately 40%."
- Virginia "The department has elected to make no cuts to an adult service programs."
- Wyoming "As Wyoming lost SSBG funds, SSBG funds were removed from the APS' budget leaving only the state general fund amount to run the program. Thus, the APS program and services to clients have not been developed as they might have been."

Responses from other states

- Kentucky "In SFY 2003, the amount of Federal SSBG funds for APS will decrease. However, the total costs of APS will increase. The state funds will be increased to offset the decreases in Federal SSBG funds."
- Oklahoma "SSBG funds have been reduced to DHS but the amount received for APS remained constant for the last 3 federal fiscal years."
- South Carolina "I don't know specifics but we had to transfer 34 workers to other programs last summer. We lost a lot of expertise and this sent the message that APS was not important. In some areas APS is now being handled by CPS workers and supervisors."
- Tennessee "Reductions in support services such as Homemaker services, etc. impair the ability of the APS program to most effectively reduce risks to victims in their own homes, etc."

Section B: APS CASES

Section B. APS Cases

B.1 Thirty six states responded with data on the number of APS reports they had received in the previous year. Because these data have been superseded by the more comprehensive and more recent *Survey of State Adult Protective Services: Abuse of Adults 60 Years of Age and Older*³ and *Survey of State Adult Protective Services: Abuse of Adults Aged 18 – 59*, these earlier findings are not described in detail here.

Briefly, the responding states reported a total of 397,473 cases in their most recent reporting year. The highest number of cases (82,266) was in California, and the lowest number (476) was in South Dakota, reflecting the wide variation in population in those two states. Texas reported the second highest number of cases, 66,052, followed by Florida at 39,516.

B.1. Please provide the following information regarding the number of APS cases statewide at the close of the most recent reporting year.

N = Total Number of Responses:	38	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ►

- Hawaii "Calendar Year - 2001."
- Kentucky "July 2000 - June 2001."
- Maine "APS Intake received 12151 calls in 2001."
- Maryland "FY 2001 - June 30, 2001."
- Massachusetts APS. "Number of APS reports investigated = 1369."
- Ohio "This data reflects state fiscal year 2001. During SFY 2001, only 67 of the 88 county departments of job and family services submitted their statistics all 4 quarters."
- Oklahoma "Responses below are for Community APS only."
- Tennessee "For 2001."
- Texas "January 1 - December 31, 2001."
- Wisconsin "175 contained specific allegations that were investigated with 35 substantiated for abuse and neglect."

► Information Not Available:	2	5.3%
-------------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES ► Maine, North Dakota.

► B.1.a. Number of APS Reports

Total Number of States Providing Data:	36	94.7%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ►

- Georgia "For SFY 2001. These are reports open for investigation and assessment."
- Kansas "Investigations. Reports may be screened out and not investigated."

³ Teaster, P., Dugar, T, Mendiondo, M., Abner, E. Cecil, K. and Otto, J. *The Survey of State Adult Protective Services: Abuse of Adults 60 Years of Age and Older*. National Center on Elder Abuse, February, 2006. Also, *The Survey of State Adult Protective Services: Abuse of Adults Aged 18 – 59*.

- Maryland "Investigations vs. reports."
- New York "30,000+"
- So. Carolina "New Clients."
- Tennessee "5,700+"
- Vermont "(1528 Screened: 642 Opened)"

DATA SNAPSHOT▶

Number of States Reporting Data	36 (94.7%)		
Total Number of APS Reports:	\$397,473		
Average Number of APS Reports Per State:	\$11,041		
States Above Average / Range High State:	9 25%	High: \$2,266 (California)	
States Below Average / Range Low State:	7 75%	Low: \$476 (South Dakota)	

SUMMARY TABLE▶

STATE	NUMBER OF APS REPORTS	PERCENT BY STATE	RANK BY STATE
Alabama	4,098	1.03%	20
Alaska	651	0.16%	33
Arizona	8,312	2.09%	13
Arkansas	3,347	0.84%	22
California	82,266	20.70%	1
Delaware	689	0.17%	32
DC	1,162	0.29%	31
Florida	39,516	9.94%	3
Georgia	12,041	3.03%	7
Hawaii	511	0.13%	35
Idaho	2,983	0.75%	23
Illinois EPS	7,360	1.85%	14
Iowa	1,524	0.38%	29
Kansas	5,336	1.34%	16
Kentucky	28,230	7.10%	5
Louisiana	3,591	0.90%	21
Maryland	4,750	1.20%	17
Massachusetts APS	4,605	1.16%	18
Michigan	9,639	2.43%	12
Mississippi	1,412	0.36%	30
New Hampshire	1,587	0.40%	27

STATE	NUMBER OF APS REPORTS	PERCENT BY STATE	RANK BY STATE
New York	30,000	7.55%	4
Ohio	11,351	2.86%	9
Oklahoma	14,046	3.53%	6
Oregon APS	2,705	0.68%	24
Oregon EPS	10,489	2.64%	11
Pennsylvania EPS	11,451	2.88%	8
Rhode Island	2,102	0.53%	26
South Carolina	4,333	1.09%	19
South Dakota	476	0.12%	36
Tennessee	5,700	1.43%	15
Texas	66,052	16.62%	2
Utah	2,165	0.54%	25
Vermont	1,528	0.38%	28
Virginia	10,942	2.75%	10
Wyoming	523	0.13%	34

B.1.b. Number of Substantiated Cases

Twenty-nine states were able to provide data on the number of cases they substantiated in their most recent reporting period. These states accounted for 295,483 of the total cases reported in the section above (76%). The total number of substantiated cases reported by these states was 130,437, or 44% of the total cases reported in those states. Some of the largest states, such as New York and Florida, were unable to provide substantiation data.

Substantiation rates varied from a very high 94.4% in Rhode Island, to a very low 3.86% in nearby Vermont. The average substantiation rate for all the reporting states was 36.57%.

► B.1.b. *Number of Substantiated Cases*

► Information Not Available:	9	23.7%
------------------------------	---	-------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Maine, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina.

N=Total Number of States Providing Data:	29	76.3%
--	----	-------

STATES ► Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ► • Utah “Substantiation requires a preponderance of evidence. Utah has another a category called suspected but unsubstantiated, which means we believe it happened, but no preponderance. We had 486 findings in that category.”

DATA SNAPSHOT►

Number of States Reporting Data	29	(76.3%)
Total Number of Substantiated Cases:	130,437	
Average Number of Substantiated Cases Per State:	4,498	
States Above Average:	5	(17.2%)
States Below Average:	24	(82.8%)
Range:	35-41,620	
Highest Ranking State:	Texas - 41,620	
Lowest Ranking State:	Wyoming – 35	

% of Total APS Reports Substantiated:	32.82%
Average % of Substantiated Cases by State:	36.57%
Range:	3.86% - 94.39%
Highest Ranking State:	Rhode Island - 94.39%
Lowest Ranking State:	Vermont- 3.86%

SUMMARY TABLE ►

STATE	NUMBER OF SUBSTANTIATED CASES FOR			% OF STATES CASES	
	STATE	% BY STATE	RANK	SUBSTANTIATED	RANK
Arizona	4217	3.23%	7	50.73%	8
Arkansas	188	0.14%	27	5.62%	28
California	32414	24.85%	2	39.40%	14
Delaware	225	0.17%	25	32.66%	16
DC	403	0.31%	20	34.68%	15
Hawaii	207	0.16%	26	40.51%	13
Idaho	696	0.53%	16	23.33%	20
Illinois EPS	4213	3.23%	8	57.24%	6
Iowa	301	0.23%	21	19.75%	24
Kansas	1108	0.85%	15	20.76%	22
Kentucky	6643	5.09%	5	23.53%	19
Louisiana	1620	1.24%	14	45.11%	10
Maryland	2231	1.71%	12	46.97%	9
Massachusetts APS	296	0.23%	22	6.43%	27
Michigan	2586	1.98%	11	26.83%	17
Mississippi	247	0.19%	24	17.49%	25
New Hampshire	665	0.51%	17	41.90%	11
Oklahoma	9498	7.28%	3	67.62%	2
Oregon EPS	649	0.50%	18	23.99%	18
Oregon APS	4354	3.34%	6	41.51%	12
Pennsylvania EPS	2626	2.01%	10	22.93%	21
Rhode Island	1984	1.52%	13	94.39%	1
South Dakota	266	0.20%	23	55.88%	7
Tennessee	3591	2.75%	9	63.00%	5
Texas	41620	31.91%	1	63.01%	4
Utah	440	0.34%	19	20.32%	23
Vermont	59	0.05%	28	3.86%	29
Virginia	7055	5.41%	4	64.48%	3
Wyoming	35	0.03%	29	6.69%	26

► B.1.c. *Number of Open / Active Cases*

► Information Not Available:	15	39.5%
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma. Oregon EPS, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Wyoming

N = Total Number of States Providing Data:	23	60.5%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Illinois EPS, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oregon APS, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia.

- NOTES ►
- Tennessee "8055 adults received services."
 - Texas "Defined as open investigations and cases in service delivery and open guardianships."

DATA SNAPSHOT►

Number of States Reporting Data	23	(60.5%)
Total Number of Open/Active Cases:	189,339	
Average Number of Open/Active Cases Per State:	8,232	
States Above Average:	4	(17.4%)
States Below Average:	19	(82.6%)
Range:	1 - 71,862	
Highest Ranking State:	California - 71,862	
Lowest Ranking State:	Arkansas - 1	
% of Total APS Reports that are Open/Active:	47.64%	
Average % of Substantiated Cases by State:	47.41%	
Range:	3.86% - 94.39%	
Highest Ranking State:	Tennessee - 141.32%	
Lowest Ranking State:	Arkansas - .03%	

SUMMARY TABLE►

STATE	NO. OF OPEN / ACTIVE CASES	% BY STATE	% OF STATE'S CASES		
			RANK	OPEN / ACTIVE	RANK
Alabama	2,191	1.2%	10	53.5%	9
Arkansas	1	0%	23	0%	22
California	71,862	38.0%	1	87.4%	6
Delaware	591	0.3%	15	85.8%	7
DC	390	0.2%	17	33.6%	13
Florida	3,919	2.1%	7	9.9%	17
Georgia	12,041	6.4%	3	100%	2
Illinois EPS	3,440	1.8%	8	46.7%	11
Kansas	4,675	2.5%	6	87.6%	5
Kentucky	514	0.3%	16	1.8%	21
Louisiana	1,967	1.0%	11	54.8%	8
Maine	1,934	1.0%	12	NA	NA
Maryland	2,462	1.3%	9	51.8%	10
Massachusetts APS	125	0.1%	20	2.7%	20
Michigan	9,639	5.1%	4	100.0%	2
Mississippi	144	0.1%	19	10.2%	16
New Hampshire	108	0.1%	21	6.8%	19
Oregon APS	334	0.2%	18	12.4%	14
South Dakota	54	0.0%	22	11.3%	15
Tennessee	8,055	4.6%	5	141.3%	1
Texas	63,443	33.5%	2	96.1%	4
Vermont	642	0.3%	14	42.0%	12
Virginia	808	0.4%	13	7.4%	18
TOTAL	189339	100%		47.6%	

► **B.1.d.** *Number of Closed Cases*

► **Information Not Available:** **20** **52.6%**

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma. Oregon APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming.

NOTES ► Maryland: "Some investigations closed with no ongoing. Others ongoing continue."

N = Total Number of States Providing Data: **18** **47.4%**

STATES ► Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Illinois EPS, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oregon EPS, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia.

NOTES ►

- California "State Fiscal Year: July1, 2000 - June 30, 2001."
- DC "647 - closed at intake, 199 closed in continuing services."
- Maine "July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001"
- New Hampshire "I am interpreting 'closed cases' as completed investigations at the time of this writing."
- Texas "Cases 'closed' is for entire FY 2001."
- Vermont "Includes carry over from prior year."

DATA SNAPSHOT ►

Number of States Reporting Data	18	(47.4%)
Total Number of Open/Active Cases:	259,370	
Average Number of Open/Active Cases Per State:	1,443	
States Above Average:	12	(66.7%)
States Below Average:	6	(33.3%)
Range:	151 - 87,604	
Highest Ranking State:	Texas - 87,604	
Lowest Ranking State:	Mississippi - 151	
% of Total APS Reports that are Open/Active:	65.25%	
Average % of Substantiated Cases by State:	47.41%	
Range:	10.69% - 132.63%	
Highest Ranking State:	Texas - 132.63%	
Lowest Ranking State:	Mississippi - 10.69%	

SUMMARY TABLE ►

STATE	NUMBER OF CLOSED CASES	% BY STATE	RANK	% OF STATES CASES CLOSED	RANK
Arkansas	3,346	1.29%	8	99.97%	2
California	69,218	26.69%	2	84.14%	11
Delaware	613	0.24%	16	88.97%	8
DC	846	0.33%	14	72.81%	13
Florida	35,597	13.72%	3	90.08%	7
Illinois EPS	3,919	1.51%	7	53.25%	14
Kentucky	27,716	10.69%	4	98.18%	3
Louisiana	2,753	1.06%	9	76.66%	12
Maine	1,913	0.74%	11	NA	NA
Massachusetts APS	1,244	0.48%	13	27.01%	16
Michigan	9,390	3.62%	6	97.42%	4
Mississippi	151	0.06%	18	10.69%	17
New Hampshire	1,479	0.57%	12	93.19%	5

STATE	NUMBER OF CLOSED CASES	% BY STATE	RANK	% OF STATES CASES CLOSED	RANK
Oregon EPS	2,371	0.91%	10	87.65%	10
South Dakota	422	0.16%	17	88.66%	9
Texas	87,604	33.78%	1	132.63%	1
Vermont	654	0.25%	15	42.80%	15
Virginia	10,134	3.91%	5	92.62%	6
TOTAL	259,370	100%		198.85%	

Section C: LOCATION OF APS PROGRAM IN STATE GOVERNMENT

C.1 State Administrative Agency for APS

In 2002, thirty five states reported on their APS Program's administrative location within state government. Of the states responding, three (8.6%) were in independent state units on aging (SUA); seven (20%) were in state units on aging located within state human services or social services agencies (DHS/DSS); five (14%) were in SUAs within larger agencies within state human services departments. Over half (51.4%) of APS Programs were located within human/social services agencies that did not include SUA's; two were independent agencies within neither human services nor aging departments. In several states, the SUA name includes the term disabilities.

► C.1. Please indicate the location that best describes where the State Administrative Agency for Elder / Adult Protective Services Program operates within your state.

N=Total Number of Responses:	35 of 37	94.6%
-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ► Responses from the Oregon EPS and APS surveys were identical for this question. As a result, the responses were combined to create one state response.

NOT REPORTING ► Idaho, Louisiana.

► a. Information Not Available:	0	0.0%
--	----------	-------------

STATES ► NONE

NOTES ► NONE

► b. An independent state unit on aging:	3	8.6%
---	----------	-------------

STATES ► Illinois EPS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island.

NOTES ► NONE

► c. State unit on aging located in the state's human service agency:	7	20.0%
--	----------	--------------

STATES ► Arizona, Delaware, Maine, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont.

NOTES ► NONE

► d. An organization in the human services agency that <u>includes</u> the state unit on aging:	5	14.3%
--	----------	--------------

STATES ► Alaska, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS

NOTES ►

- Alaska
- Oregon

“Within Department of Administration; Division of Senior Services.”
Responses from the Oregon EPS and APS surveys were identical for this question. As a result, the responses were combined.

▶ e. An organization within the human services agency that does not include the state unit on aging: **7** **20.0%**

STATES ▶ Alabama, California, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ▶ • Virginia "Department of Social Services."

▶ f. An independent organization that is neither the human services nor state unit on aging: **1** **2.9%**

STATES ▶ Texas

NOTES ▶ NONE

▶ g. A division/organizational unit within the Office of the Attorney General: **0** **0.0%**

STATES ▶ NONE

NOTES ▶ NONE

▶ h. Other (Please Describe): **1** **2.9%**

STATES ▶ Massachusetts APS.

NOTES ▶ • Massachusetts "An independent state agency that is neither the human services nor state unit on aging."

SUMMARY TABLE 1▶

BY RESPONSE

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY RESPONSES			
	#	%	RANK
a. Information Not Available	0	0.0%	
b. An independent state unit on aging:	3	8.57%	4
c. State unit on aging located in the state's human service agency:	7	20.0%	2
d. An organization within the human services agency that includes the state unit on aging:	5	14.29%	3
e. An organization within the human services agency that does not include the state unit on aging:	18	51.43%	1
f. An independent organization that is neither the human services nor state unit on aging:	1	2.86%	5
g. A division/organizational unit within the Office of the Attorney General:	0	0.0%	7
h. Other (please describe):	1	2.86%	5
TOTAL	35	100.0%	

SUMMARY TABLE 2▶

BY STATE

C.1. SUMMARY TABLE 2 - RESPONSE KEY 2002 DATA
a. Information Not Available
b. An independent state unit on aging (SUA);
c. State unit on aging located in the state's human service agency;
d. Organization in the human services agency that includes the SUA;
e. Organization in human services agency that does not include SUA;
f. An independent organization (neither human services nor SUA);
g. A division/unit within the Office of the Attorney General;
h. Other:

STATE	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.
Alabama					1			
Alaska				1				
Arizona			1					
Arkansas				1				
California					1			
Delaware			1					
DC					1			
Florida					1			
Georgia					1			
Hawaii					1			
Idaho	NO RESPONSE							
Illinois EPS		1						
Iowa					1			
Kansas					1			
Kentucky					1			
Louisiana	NO RESPONSE							
Maine			1					
Maryland					1			
Massachusetts APS*								1
Michigan					1			
Mississippi					1			
New Hampshire				1				
New York					1			
North Dakota			1					
Ohio					1			
Oklahoma				1				
Oregon APS/EPS*				1				
Pennsylvania EPS		1						
Rhode Island		1						
South Carolina					1			
South Dakota			1					
Tennessee					1			
Texas						1		
Utah			1					
Vermont			1					
Virginia					1			
Wyoming					1			
TOTAL	0	3	7	5	18	1	0	1
PERCENT	0.00%	8.57%	20.00%	14.29%	51.43%	2.86%	0.00%	2.86%
RANK	NA	4	2	3	1	5	7	5

*Massachusetts' EPS Program is in the SUA; as is Oregon's.

A brief, follow-up survey was conducted in the spring of 2007 to collect information about any major changes in each state's administrative location since the original survey was conducted in 2002 found the following.

Thirty states responded; of those, eleven have their state APS Office located within their social services department and nineteen were within state units on aging (some of which are part of larger social services agencies as noted above). Seven, or 36%, of the programs in SUAs had been transferred there in the past few years from either a social services or a child protective services state agency.

In the 2007 survey, states were also asked whether direct APS services to clients were provided by state, county, area agency on aging, or other types of agencies. Of the thirty states that reported, twenty-two used state employees to provide direct APS services, five had a county based APS system; five had APS client services provided by area agencies on aging, and eight indicated other not for profit. These numbers add up to more than 30, because several states indicated that

SUMMARY TABLE 1 ► SUMMARY TABLE 2007: DATA ON STATE APS PROGRAM LOCATION WITHIN STATE GOVERNMENT AND LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT PROVIDING DIRECT APS SERVICES

State	30 Responding	SUA*	DHS/DSS	State Direct Services**	County Direct Services	AAA Direct Services	Other Direct Services
Alabama			X	X			
Alaska***			X	X			
Arkansas	X			X			
Arizona	X					X	X
Colorado	X				X		
Delaware***	X			X			
DC			X	X			
Georgia	X*			X			
Illinois EPS	X						X
Indiana	X						X
Iowa			X	X		X	X
Kansas			X				
Kentucky			X	X			
Louisiana	X*			X			
Maryland			X	X			
Michigan			X	X		X	X
Minnesota	X				X		
Missouri	X*						
Nevada	X			X			
New Hampshire***	X			X			
New Mexico	X*			X		X	X
North Carolina***	X*				X		
Oklahoma			X	X			
Oregon APS			X****	X	X		
Pennsylvania EPS	X					X	
Rhode Island	X			X			X
South Dakota	X			X			
Utah	X			X			
Wisconsin***	X				X		
Wyoming			X				
TOTALS	19	11	11	19	5	5	7
Percentages	63%	36%	36%	63%	17%	17%	23%

*APS Program moved to SUA within past several years; note: some SUAs are within larger departments of social or human services. **Several states reported having more than one level of government providing direct services. ***SUA name includes reference to disabilities ****Oregon EPS is in SUA

C.2. Are you able to provide an up-to-date organizational chart that identifies the position where the State Administrative Agency for Elder/Adult Protective Services Program operates within your state's structure?

N = Total Number of Responses: 36 of 38 97.3%

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ► • NOTE: Responses from the Oregon EPS and APS surveys were identical for this question. As a result, the responses were combined to create one state response.

NOT REPORTING ► North Dakota

► Information Not Available: 2 5.6%

STATES ► Idaho, Louisiana.

NOTES ► • NONE

► Yes: 27 75.0%

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming.

NOTES ► • Ohio "As of "02/07/2002"
• Oregon Responses from the Oregon EPS and APS surveys were identical for this question. As a result, the responses were combined to create one state response.

► No: 7 19.4%

STATES ► Arkansas, DC, Kansas, Mississippi, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Virginia.

NOTES ► • NONE

SUMMARY TABLE ►

RESPONSE	#	%
Information Not Available:	2	5.6%
Yes:	27	75.0%
No:	7	19.4%
TOTAL	36	97.3%

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS SUBMITTED WITH SURVEY ►

STATE	ON FILE	STATE	ON FILE	STATE	ON FILE
Alabama	YES	Iowa	NO	Oregon APS/EPS	YES
Alaska	YES	Kentucky	YES	Pennsylvania EPS	NO
Arizona	NO	Maine	YES	Rhode Island	NO
California	NO	Maryland	YES	South Carolina	YES
Delaware	YES	Massachusetts	NO	Tennessee	YES
Florida	YES	Michigan	YES	Texas	YES
Georgia	YES	New York	YES	Utah	YES
Hawaii	YES	Ohio	NO	Vermont	YES
Illinois EPS	NO	Oklahoma	NO	Wyoming	NO

Section D: APS PROGRAM STAFFING

Section D.1 State APS Program Staffing

Thirty six states reported on their state staffing levels; they reported a total of 968 state APS staff, or an average of 27 state staff per reporting state. The highest number of staff was in Kentucky, with 297, followed by Tennessee at 126. Four responding states had only one state level APS staff person; those were Idaho, Mississippi, North Dakota, Virginia and Wyoming.

The level of state staffing depends to some extent on whether the state administers APS services directly through centrally administered state staff, through regions, through counties, or, as in one or two states, through local, public or not for profit agencies on contract. For example, Illinois, a large state, has only a handful of state level EPS staff, because its EPS direct services are provided by designated local, largely not for profit agencies on contract, and much of the oversight and monitoring is done by Area Agencies on Aging, again on contract with the state.

California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Colorado and other states administer their APS Programs on a county basis, thus the number of staff at the state level is greatly reduced. Michigan, Alabama, and Tennessee, on the other hand, provide APS through state employees, thus the number of state employees is considerably higher. The tables in the appendices detail each reporting state's APS staff at the state level. See table on page 25 for more information on at which level of government states provide direct client services.

D.1. *Using the grid provided below, please list the official title and full time equivalency (FTE) percentage for each State APS Program staff member. Please refer to your program's organizational chart.*

N = Total Number of Responses:	36 of 38	94.7%
---------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois EPS, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS and APS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOT REPORTING ► Pennsylvania EPS, South Dakota.

DATA SNAPSHOT ►

NUMBER OF STATE APS STAFF		
Number of States Reporting Data	36	(94.7%)
Total Number of State APS Staff:	968	
Average Number of State APS Staff per State:	26.89	
States Above Average:	8	(22.2%)
States Below Average:	28	(77.8%)
Range:	1 - 297	
Highest Ranking State:	Kentucky - 297	
Lowest Ranking State:	Idaho, Mississippi, North Dakota, Virginia, Wyoming - 1	
NUMBER OF FTE STATE APS STAFF		
Total Number of FTE State APS Staff:	875.11	
Average Number of FTE State APS Staff per State:	24.30	
States Above Average:	7	(19.4%)
States Below Average:	29	(80.6%)
Range:	.2 - 297	
Highest Ranking State:	Kentucky - 297	
Lowest Ranking State:	North Dakota - .2	

SUMMARY TABLE▶

STATE	# of STATE APS STAFF	% of TOTAL STATE STAFF by STATE	RANK by STATE	# OF FTE STATE APS STAFF	% of FTE STATE APS STAFF by STATE
Alabama	9	0.93%	15	8.5	94.44%
Alaska	8	0.83%	16	7.5	93.75%
Arizona	7	0.72%	19	7	100.00%
Arkansas	5	0.52%	23	5	100.00%
California	8	0.83%	16	6.4	80.00%
Delaware	11	1.14%	12	10.7	97.27%
DC	29	3.00%	8	26.65	91.90%
Florida	6	0.62%	20	6	100.00%
Georgia	2	0.21%	28	2	100.00%
Hawaii	25	2.58%	9	22.75	91.00%
Idaho	1	0.10%	32	0.5	50.00%
Illinois EPS	8	0.83%	16	6	75.00%
Iowa	4	0.41%	27	3.15	78.75%
Kansas	70	7.23%	5	69.5	99.29%
Kentucky	297	30.68%	1	297	100.00%
Louisiana	2	0.21%	28	2	100.00%
Maine	78	8.06%	3	75.8	97.18%
Maryland	6	0.62%	20	1.6	26.67%
Massachusetts APS	40	4.13%	7	36.75	91.88%
Michigan	2	0.21%	28	1.2	60.00%
Mississippi	1	0.10%	32	0.7	70.00%
New Hampshire	65	6.71%	6	0.25	0.38%
New York	5	0.52%	23	5	100.00%
North Dakota	1	0.10%	32	0.2	20.00%
Ohio	2	0.21%	28	1.3	65.00%
Oklahoma	16	1.65%	11	15.4	96.25%
Oregon APS	21	2.17%	10	21	100.00%
Oregon EPS	5	0.52%	23	4.5	90.00%
Rhode Island	11	1.14%	12	11	100.00%
South Carolina	6	0.62%	20	6	100.00%
South Dakota	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
Tennessee	126	13.02%	2	126	100.00%
Texas	74	7.64%	4	73.76	99.68%
Utah	5	0.52%	23	4	80.00%
Vermont	10	1.03%	14	8	80.00%
Virginia	1	0.10%	32	1	100.00%
Wyoming	1	0.10%	32	1	100.00%
TOTAL	968	100%		875.11	90.40%

STATE SUMMARIES▶ NOTE: Each State Summary is comprised of two (2) tables.

TABLE 1: The first table provides a complete listing of all Position Titles reported by the state and each position's Full Time Equivalency percentage.

TABLE 2: The second table provides cumulative data for each Position Title Category. Data include: Position Title, Number of Employees per Position, Percentage of Employees represented by Position compared to total number of employees for the State, Number of FTE State APS Staff per Position Category.

STATE SUMMARY ► ALABAMA

#	POSITION TITLE - ALABAMA	FTE %
1	Acting Director	100%
2	Administrative Assistant	100%
3	Administrative Assistant	100%
4	Program Specialist	50%
5	Program Specialist	100%
6	Program Specialist	100%
7	Program Specialist	100%
8	Program Specialist	100%
9	Social Worker	100%
9	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	8.50

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - ALABAMA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Acting Director	1	12.50%	1.00
Administrative Assistant	2	25.00%	2.00
Program Specialist	5	62.50%	4.50
Social Worker	1	12.50%	1.00
TOTAL	9	100%	8.50

STATE SUMMARY ► ALASKA

#	POSITION TITLE - ALASKA	FTE %
1	Administrative Clerk III	100%
2	Program Coordinator	50%
3	Social Worker III	100%
4	Social Worker III	100%
5	Social Worker III	100%
6	Social Worker III	100%
7	Social Worker III	100%
8	Social Worker III	100%
8	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	7.50

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - ALASKA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Clerk III	1	12.50%	1.00
Program Coordinator	1	12.50%	1.00
Social Worker III	6	75.00%	6.00
TOTAL	8	100%	8.00

STATE SUMMARY ► ARIZONA

#	POSITION TITLE - ARIZONA	FTE %
1	Economic Security District Program Manager I	100%
2	Human Services Specialists III - Field	100%
3	Human Services Specialists III - Hotline	100%
4	Human Services Unit Supervisor	100%
5	Human Services Worker I - Title V	100%
6	Human Services Worker II	100%
7	Operations Manager	100%
7	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	7.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - ARIZONA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Economic Security District Program Manager I	1	14.29%	1.00
Human Services Specialists III - Field	1	14.29%	1.00
Human Services Specialists III - Hotline	1	14.29%	1.00
Human Services Unit Supervisor	1	14.29%	1.00
Human Services Worker I - Title V	1	14.29%	1.00
Human Services Worker II	1	14.29%	1.00
POSITION TITLE - ARIZONA Continued	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Operations Manager	1	14.29%	1.00
TOTAL	7	100%	7.00

STATE SUMMARY ► ARKANSAS

#	POSITION TITLE - ARNKANSAS	FTE %
1	Administrative Assistant	100%
2	Intake Specialist	100%
3	Program Administrator	100%
4	Program Supervisor	100%
5	Program Supervisor	100%
5	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	5.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - ARKANSAS	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Assistant	1	20.00%	1.00
Intake Specialist	1	20.00%	1.00
Program Administrator	1	20.00%	1.00
Program Supervisor	2	40.00%	2.00
TOTAL	5	100.00%	5.00

STATE SUMMARY ► CALIFORNIA

#	POSITION TITLE - CALIFORNIA	FTE %
1	Chief of the Adult Programs Branch	15%
2	Chief of the APS Bureau	100%
3	Office Technician	25%
4	Staff Analyst	100%
5	Staff Analyst	100%
6	Staff Analyst	100%
7	Staff Analyst	100%
8	Staff Analyst	100%
8	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	6.40

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - CALIFORNIA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Chief of the Adult Programs Branch	1	12.50%	0.15
Chief of the APS Bureau	1	12.50%	1.00
Office Technician	1	12.50%	0.25
Staff Analyst	5	62.50%	5.00
TOTAL	7	100%	7.00

STATE SUMMARY ► DELAWARE

#	POSITION TITLE - DELAWARE	FTE %
1	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
2	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
3	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
4	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
5	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
6	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
7	Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	100%
8	Social Service Administrator	100%
9	Social Worker Assistant	70%
10	Social Worker Case Manager Supervisor	100%
11	Social Worker Case Manager Supervisor	100%
11	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	10.70

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - DELAWARE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Senior Social Worker - Case Manager	7	63.64%	7.00
Social Service Administrator	1	9.09%	1.00
Social Worker Assistant	1	9.09%	0.70
Social Worker Case Manager Supervisor	2	18.18%	2.00
TOTAL	11	100%	10.70

STATE SUMMARY ►

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#	POSITION TITLE – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	FTE %
1	Chief	100%
2	Program Specialist	5%
3	Social Services Assistant	100%
4	Social Services Assistant	100%
5	Social Services Assistant	100%
6	Social Services Assistant	100%
7	Social Worker	100%
8	Social Worker	100%
9	Social Worker	100%
10	Social Worker	100%
11	Social Worker	100%
12	Social Worker	100%
13	Social Worker	100%
14	Social Worker	100%
15	Social Worker	100%
16	Social Worker	100%
17	Social Worker	100%
18	Social Worker	100%
19	Social Worker	100%
20	Social Worker	100%
21	Social Worker	100%
22	Social Worker	100%
23	Social Worker	100%
24	Social Worker	100%
25	Staff Assistant	30%
26	Staff Assistant	30%
27	Supervisory Social Worker	100%
28	Supervisory Social Worker	100%
29	Supervisory Social Worker - Intake	100%
29	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	26.65

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Chief	1	3.45%	1.00
Program Specialist	1	3.45%	0.05
Social Services Assistant	4	13.79%	4.00
Social Worker	18	62.07%	18.00
Staff Assistant	2	6.90%	0.60
Supervisory Social Worker	2	6.90%	2.00
Supervisory Social Worker - Intake	1	3.45%	1.00
TOTAL	29	100%	26.65

STATE SUMMARY ► FLORIDA

#	POSITION TITLE - FLORIDA	FTE %
1	Acting Director	100%
2	Administrative Assistant	100%
3	Operations and Management Manager	100%
4	Senior Management Analyst II	100%
5	Senior Management Analyst II	100%
6	Sr. Human Services Program Specialist	100%
6	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	6.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - FLORIDA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Acting Director	1	16.67%	1.00
Administrative Assistant	1	16.67%	1.00
Operations and Management Manager	1	16.67%	1.00
Senior Management Analyst II	2	33.33%	2.00
Sr. Human Services Program Specialist	1	16.67%	1.00
TOTAL	6	100%	6.00

STATE SUMMARY ► GEORGIA

#	POSITION TITLE - GEORGIA	FTE %
1	DFCS Program Consultant	100%
2	DFCS Program Consultant (1)	100%
2	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	2.00

NOTES ► • (1) "New in 3/2002."

POSITION TITLE - GEORGIA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
DFCS Program Consultant	2	100%	2.00
TOTAL	2	100%	2.00

STATE SUMMARY ► HAWAII

#	POSITION TITLE - HAWAII	FTE %
1	Assistant Program Administrator	75%
2	Clerk Typist	100%
3	Nurse	100%
4	Nurse	100%
5	Secretary	100%
6	Social Services Assistant	100%
7	Social Services Assistant	100%
8	Social Services Assistant	100%
9	Social Services Assistant	100%
10	Social Services Assistant	100%
11	Social Services Assistant	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – HAWAII Continued	FTE %
12	Social Worker	100%
13	Social Worker	100%
14	Social Worker	100%
15	Social Worker	100%
16	Social Worker	100%
17	Social Worker	100%
18	Social Worker	100%
19	Social Worker	100%
20	Social Worker	100%
21	Supervisor	100%
22	Supervisor	50%
23	Supervisor	50%
24	Supervisor	50%
25	Supervisor	50%
25	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	22.75

NOTES ► ● NONE

POSITION TITLE - HAWAII	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Assistant Program Administrator	1	4.00%	0.75
Clerk Typist	1	4.00%	1.00
Nurse	2	8.00%	2.00
Secretary	1	4.00%	1.00
Social Services Assistant	6	24.00%	6.00
Social Worker	9	36.00%	9.00
Supervisor	5	20.00%	3.00
TOTAL	25	100%	22.75

STATE SUMMARY ► IDAHO

#	POSITION TITLE - IDAHO	FTE %
1	Senior Services Program Specialist	50%
1	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	.50

NOTES ► ● NONE

POSITION TITLE - IDAHO	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Senior Services Program Specialist	1	100%	.50
TOTAL	1	100%	.50

STATE SUMMARY ► ILLINOIS EPS

#	POSITION TITLE - ILLINOIS	FTE %
1	Administrative Assistant	50%
2	Bureau Chief	50%
3	Elder Abuse Program Coordinator	100%
4	Elder Abuse Program Coordinator	100%
5	Elder Abuse Program Coordinator	100%
6	Elder Abuse Program Coordinator	50%
7	Legal Services Developer	50%
8	Student Intern/Clerk	100%
8	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	6.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - ILLINOIS	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Bureau Chief	1	12.50%	0.50
Elder Abuse Program Coordinator	4	50.00%	3.50
Administrative Assistant	1	12.50%	0.50
Legal Services Developer	1	12.50%	0.50
Student Intern/Clerk	1	12.50%	1.00
TOTAL	8	100.00%	6.00

STATE SUMMARY ► IOWA

#	POSITION TITLE - IOWA	FTE %
1	Abuse Registry Clerk	75%
2	Bureau Chief, Protective Services	5%
3	Criminal Clerks	100%
4	Program Manager, Adult Protective Services	90%
4	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	3.15

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - IOWA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Abuse Registry Clerk	1.00	25.00%	0.75
Bureau Chief, Protective Services	1.00	25.00%	0.50
Criminal Clerks	1.00	25.00%	1.00
Program Manager, Adult Protective Services	1.00	25.00%	0.90
TOTAL	4.00	100.00%	3.15

STATE SUMMARY ► KANSAS

#	POSITION TITLE - KANSAS	FTE %
1	APS Social Worker	100%
2	APS Social Worker	100%
3	APS Social Worker	100%
4	APS Social Worker	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – KANSAS Continued	FTE %
5	APS Social Worker	100%
6	APS Social Worker	100%
7	APS Social Worker	100%
8	APS Social Worker	100%
9	APS Social Worker	100%
10	APS Social Worker	100%
11	APS Social Worker	100%
12	APS Social Worker	100%
13	APS Social Worker	100%
14	APS Social Worker	100%
15	APS Social Worker	100%
16	APS Social Worker	100%
17	APS Social Worker	100%
18	APS Social Worker	100%
19	APS Social Worker	100%
20	APS Social Worker	100%
21	APS Social Worker	100%
22	APS Social Worker	100%
23	APS Social Worker	100%
24	APS Social Worker	100%
25	APS Social Worker	100%
26	APS Social Worker	100%
27	APS Social Worker	100%
28	APS Social Worker	100%
29	APS Social Worker	100%
30	APS Social Worker	100%
31	APS Social Worker	100%
32	APS Social Worker	100%
33	APS Social Worker	100%
34	APS Social Worker	100%
35	APS Social Worker	100%
36	APS Social Worker	100%
37	APS Social Worker	100%
38	APS Social Worker	100%
39	APS Social Worker	100%
40	APS Social Worker	100%
41	APS Social Worker	100%
42	APS Social Worker	100%
43	APS Social Worker	100%
44	APS Social Worker	100%
45	APS Social Worker	100%
46	APS Social Worker	100%
47	APS Social Worker	100%
48	APS Social Worker	100%
49	APS Social Worker	100%
50	APS Social Worker	100%
51	APS Social Worker	100%
52	APS Social Worker	100%
53	APS Social Worker	50%
54	APS Supervisor	100%
55	APS Supervisor	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – KANSAS Continued	FTE %
56	APS Supervisor	100%
57	APS Supervisor	100%
58	APS Supervisor	100%
59	APS Supervisor	100%
60	APS Supervisor	100%
61	APS Supervisor	100%
62	APS Supervisor	100%
63	APS Supervisor	100%
64	APS Supervisor	100%
65	Program Support Worker	100%
66	Program Support Worker	100%
67	Program Support Worker	100%
68	Program Support Worker	100%
69	Program Support Worker	100%
70	Program Support Worker	100%
70	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	69.50

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - KANSAS	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
APS Social Worker	53	75.71%	52.50
APS Supervisor	11	15.71%	11.00
Program Support Worker	6	8.57%	6.00
TOTAL	70	100%	69.50

STATE SUMMARY ► LOUISIANA

#	POSITION TITLE - LOUISIANA	FTE %
1	Program Director	100%
2	Program Specialist	100%
2	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	2.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - LOUISIANA	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Program Director	1	50.00%	1.00
Program Specialist	1	50.00%	1.00
TOTAL	2	100%	2.00

STATE SUMMARY ► MAINE

#	POSITION TITLE - MAINE	FTE %
1	Case Aide	100%
2	Casework Supervisor	100%
3	Casework Supervisor	100%
4	Casework Supervisor	100%
5	Casework Supervisor	100%
6	Casework Supervisor	100%
7	Casework Supervisor	100%
8	Casework Supervisor	100%
9	Casework Supervisor	100%
10	Caseworker	100%
11	Caseworker	100%
12	Caseworker	100%
13	Caseworker	100%
14	Caseworker	100%
15	Caseworker	100%
16	Caseworker	100%
17	Caseworker	100%
18	Caseworker	100%
19	Caseworker	100%
20	Caseworker	100%
21	Caseworker	100%
22	Caseworker	100%
23	Caseworker	100%
24	Caseworker	100%
25	Caseworker	100%
26	Caseworker	100%
27	Caseworker	100%
28	Caseworker	100%
29	Caseworker	100%
30	Caseworker	100%
31	Caseworker	100%
32	Caseworker	100%
33	Caseworker	100%
34	Caseworker	100%
35	Caseworker	100%
36	Caseworker	100%
37	Caseworker	100%
38	Caseworker	100%
39	Caseworker	100%
40	Caseworker	100%
41	Caseworker	100%
42	Caseworker	100%
43	Caseworker	100%
44	Caseworker	100%
45	Caseworker	100%
46	Caseworker	100%
47	Caseworker	100%
48	Caseworker	100%
49	Caseworker	100%
50	Caseworker	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – MAINE Continued	FTE %
51	Caseworker	100%
52	Caseworker	100%
53	Caseworker	100%
54	Caseworker	100%
55	Caseworker	100%
56	Caseworker	100%
57	Caseworker	100%
58	Caseworker	100%
59	Caseworker	100%
60	Caseworker	100%
61	Caseworker	100%
62	Caseworker	50%
63	Caseworker	50%
64	Caseworker	50%
65	Contract Case Aide	100%
66	Contract Case Aide	100%
67	Contract Case Aide	100%
68	Contract Case Aide	100%
69	Contract Case Aide	100%
70	Contract Case Aide	80%
71	Director, Regional Operations	100%
72	Financial Specialist	100%
73	Information Specialist (Contract)	100%
74	Intake Coordinator	100%
75	Program Specialist	50%
76	Protective Program Administration	100%
77	Protective Program Administration	100%
78	Protective Program Administration	100%
78	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	75.80

NOTES ►

- NONE

POSITION TITLE - MAINE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Case Aide	1	1.28%	1.00
Casework Supervisor	8	10.26%	8.00
Caseworker	55	70.51%	53.50
Contract Case Aide	6	7.69%	5.80
Director, Regional Operations	1	1.28%	1.00
Financial Specialist	1	1.28%	1.00
Information Specialist (Contract)	1	1.28%	1.00
Intake Coordinator	1	1.28%	1.00
Program Specialist	1	1.28%	0.50
Protective Program Administration	3	3.85%	3.00
TOTAL	78	100%	75.80

STATE SUMMARY ► MARYLAND

#	POSITION TITLE - MARYLAND	FTE %
1	Deputy Director of Budget and Systems	30%
2	Deputy Director of Planning and Development	40%
3	Director, Office of Adult Services	30%
4	Specialist, Budget and Systems	0%
5	Specialist, Planning and Development	60%
6	Specialist, Planning and Development	0%
6	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	1.60

NOTES ► • “The office of Adult Services manages several programs. The percentages noted above indicate the time devoted to APS.”

POSITION TITLE - MARYLAND	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Deputy Director of Budget and Systems	1	16.67%	0.30
Deputy Director of Planning and Development	1	16.67%	0.40
Director, Office of Adult Services	1	16.67%	0.30
Specialist, Budget and Systems	1	16.67%	0.00
Specialist, Planning and Development	2	33.33%	0.60
TOTAL	6	100%	1.60

STATE SUMMARY ► MASSACHUSETTS APS

#	POSITION TITLE – MASSACHUSETTS APS	FTE %
1	Abuse Prevention and Outreach Coordinator	100%
2	Administrative Assistant II	100%
3	Assistant General Counsel	100%
4	Chairman-Commissioner	25%
5	Commissioner	25%
6	Commissioner	25%
7	Deputy General Counsel	100%
8	Director of Administration and Finance	100%
9	Director of investigations/oversight/prevention	100%
10	Executive Director	100%
11	File Clerk (Special Grant Project)	100%
12	File Clerk (Special Grant Project)	50%
13	File Clerk (Special Grant Project)	50%
14	File Clerk/Data Entry (AAIL)	100%
15	General Counsel	100%
16	Intake/Oversight Manager	100%
17	Intake/Oversight Manager	100%
18	Intake/Oversight Officer (COI)	100%
19	Intake/Oversight Officer (COI)	100%
20	Intake/Oversight Officer (COII)	100%
21	Intake/Oversight Officer (COII)	100%
22	Intake/Oversight Officer (COII)	100%
23	Intake/Oversight Officer (COII)	100%
24	Intake/Oversight Officer (COIII)	100%
25	Intake/Oversight Officer (COIII)	100%
26	Investigations Manager	100%
27	Investigator (COII)	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – MASSACHUSETTS Continued	FTE %
28	Investigator (COII)	100%
29	Investigator (COII)	100%
30	Investigator (COII)	100%
31	Investigator (COII)	100%
32	Investigator (COII)	100%
33	Investigator (COIII)	100%
34	MIS Coordinator	100%
35	Personnel Analyst	100%
36	Receptionist (Clerk II)	100%
37	State Police Officer*	100%
38	State Police Officer*	100%
39	State Police Officer*	100%
40	State Police Officer*	100%
40	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	36.75

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - MASSACHUSETTS	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Abuse Prevention and Outreach Coordinator	1	2.50%	1.00
Administrative Assistant II	1	2.50%	1.00
Assistant General Counsel	1	2.50%	1.00
Chairman-Commissioner	1	2.50%	0.25
Commissioner	2	5.00%	0.50
Deputy General Counsel	1	2.50%	1.00
Director of Administration and Finance	1	2.50%	1.00
Director of investigations/oversight/prevention	1	2.50%	1.00
Executive Director	1	2.50%	1.00
File Clerk (Special Grant Project)	3	7.50%	2.00
File Clerk/Data Entry (AAII)	1	2.50%	1.00
General Counsel	1	2.50%	1.00
Intake/Oversight Manager	2	5.00%	2.00
Intake/Oversight Officer (COI)	2	5.00%	2.00
Intake/Oversight Officer (COII)	4	10.00%	4.00
Intake/Oversight Officer (COIII)	2	5.00%	2.00
Investigations Manager	1	2.50%	1.00
Investigator (COII)	6	15.00%	6.00
Investigator (COIII)	1	2.50%	1.00
MIS Coordinator	1	2.50%	1.00
Personnel Analyst	1	2.50%	1.00
Receptionist (Clerk II)	1	2.50%	1.00
State Police Officer*	4	10.00%	4.00
TOTAL	40	100%	36.75

STATE SUMMARY ► MICHIGAN

#	POSITION TITLE - MICHIGAN	FTE %
1	APS Policy Writer/Trainer	100%
2	Manager, Adult Protective Services	20%
2	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	1.20

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE - MICHIGAN	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
APS Policy Writer/Trainer	1	50.00%	1.00
Manager, Adult Protective Services	1	50.00%	0.20
TOTAL	2	100%	1.20

STATE SUMMARY ► MISSISSIPPI

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Social Worker Advanced	70%
1	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	.70

NOTES ► • "Unable to provide as Mississippi does not have APS staff. No staff is assigned solely to the APS program at any level (state, regional or county). State, regional and county staff handle all aspects of Child Protective Services in addition to the APS program. The Abuse/Neglect hotline serves both the CPS and APS programs."

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Social Worker Advanced	1	100%	0.70
TOTAL	1	100%	0.70

STATE SUMMARY ► NEW HAMPSHIRE

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Administrative Staff	
2	Administrative Staff	
3	Administrative Staff	
4	APS Investigator	
5	APS Investigator	
6	APS Supervisor	
7	Attorney	0.25
8	Social Work Supervisor	
9	Social Work Supervisor	
10	Social Work Supervisor	
11	Social Work Supervisor	
12	Social Work Supervisor	
13	Social Work Supervisor	
14	Social Work Supervisor	
15	Social Work Supervisor	
16	Social Work Supervisor	

#	POSITION TITLE – NEW HAMPSHIRE Continued	FTE %
17	Social Work Supervisor	
18	Social Worker	
19	Social Worker	
20	Social Worker	
21	Social Worker	
22	Social Worker	
23	Social Worker	
24	Social Worker	
25	Social Worker	
26	Social Worker	
27	Social Worker	
28	Social Worker	
29	Social Worker	
30	Social Worker	
31	Social Worker	
32	Social Worker	
33	Social Worker	
34	Social Worker	
35	Social Worker	
36	Social Worker	
37	Social Worker	
38	Social Worker	
39	Social Worker	
40	Social Worker	
41	Social Worker	
42	Social Worker	
43	Social Worker	
44	Social Worker	
45	Social Worker	
46	Social Worker	
47	Social Worker	
48	Social Worker	
49	Social Worker	
50	Social Worker	
51	Social Worker	
52	Social Worker	
53	Social Worker	
54	Social Worker	
55	Social Worker	
56	Social Worker	
57	Social Worker	
58	Social Worker	
59	Social Worker	
60	Social Worker	
61	Social Worker	
62	Social Worker	
63	Social Worker	
64	Social Worker	
65	Social Worker	
65	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	0.25

NOTES ► “There are 48 generalist Social Workers and 10 Social Work Supervisors located in 12 District Offices around the State, who carry/supervise a mixed workload of APS and other social service cases that encompass incapacitated adults eighteen years of age and older (70% are elderly). In addition, there is a Central Office APS Specialized Unit comprised of two APS Investigators and one Supervisor who are responsible to receive and investigate APS reports of abuse, neglect and/or exploitation that occur in: group homes for the developmentally disabled and/or mentally ill, rehabilitation centers, general hospitals and unlicensed facilities. There are also three Central Office Administrative staff who have responsibilities for the State's APS Program, as well as one Attorney (25% of the Attorney's time is available for APS). The State Long Term Care Ombudsman's Office currently has APS responsibilities in Nursing Facilities, licensed Assisted Living Facilities and licensed Residential Care Facilities.”

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Staff	3	4.62%	INA
APS Investigator	2	3.08%	INA
APS Supervisor	1	1.54%	INA
Attorney	1	1.54%	.25
Social Work Supervisor	10	15.38%	INA
Social Worker	48	73.85%	INA
TOTAL	65	100%	0.00

STATE SUMMARY ► NEW YORK

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Director: Bureau of Adult Services	100%
5	Keyboard Specialist	100%
4	Specialists in Adult Services I	100%
2	Specialists in Adult Services II	100%
3	Specialists in Adult Services II	100%
5	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	5.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Director: Bureau of Adult Services	1	20.00%	1.00
Keyboard Specialist	1	20.00%	1.00
Specialists in Adult Services I	1	20.00%	1.00
Specialists in Adult Services II	2	40.00%	2.00
TOTAL	5	100%	5.00

STATE SUMMARY ► NORTH DAKOTA

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Elder Rights Administrator	20.00
1	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	0.20

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Director: Bureau of Adult Services	1	100%	0.20
TOTAL	1	100%	0.20

STATE SUMMARY ► OHIO

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Human Services Program Administrator 3	30%
2	ODJFS Developer 2	100%
2	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	1.30

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Human Services Program Administrator 3	1	50.00%	0.30
ODJFS Developer 2	1	50.00%	1.00
TOTAL	2	100%	1.30

STATE SUMMARY ► OKLAHOMA

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Administrative Assistant I (Community APS)	100%
2	Administrative Assistant II (Community APS)	100%
3	Assistant General Counsel (Legal Division assigned APS responsibility)	100%
4	Assistant General Counsel (Legal Division assigned APS responsibility)	60%
5	Assistant General Counsel (Legal Division assigned APS responsibility)	80%
6	Program Field Representative (Community APS)	100%
7	Program Field Representative (Community APS)	100%
8	Program Field Representative (Community APS)	100%
9	Program Field Representative (Community APS)	100%
10	Program Field Representative (LTC Investigations unit of APS)	100%
11	Program Field Representative (LTC Investigations unit of APS)	100%
12	Program Field Representative (LTC Investigations unit of APS)	100%
13	Program Manager II (LTC Investigations unit)	100%
14	Program Manager III (LTC and Community APS)	100%
15	Secretary I (LTC APS unit)	100%
16	Secretary II (LTC APS unit)	100%
16	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	15.40

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Assistant I (Community APS)	1	6.25%	1.00
Administrative Assistant II (Community APS)	1	6.25%	1.00
Assistant General Counsel (Legal Division assigned APS responsibility)	3	18.75%	2.40
Program Field Representative (Community APS)	4	25.00%	4.00
Program Field Representative (LTC Investigations unit of APS)	3	18.75%	3.00
Program Manager II (LTC Investigations unit)	1	6.25%	1.00
Program Manager III (LTC and Community APS)	1	6.25%	1.00
Secretary I (LTC APS unit)	1	6.25%	1.00
Secretary II (LTC APS unit)	1	6.25%	1.00
TOTAL	16	100%	15.40

STATE SUMMARY ► OREGON EPS

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Data Manager/Quality Assurance	100%
2	Director	100%
3	Investigator	100%
4	Investigator	100%
5	Investigator	100%
6	Investigator	100%
7	Investigator	100%
8	Investigator	100%
9	Investigator	100%
10	Investigator	100%
11	Investigator	100%
12	Regional Protective Services Coordinator	100%
13	Regional Protective Services Coordinator	100%
14	Regional Protective Services Coordinator	100%
15	Regional Protective Services Coordinator	100%
16	Regional Protective Services Coordinator	100%
17	Support Staff	100%
18	Support Staff	100%
19	Training Program Manager	100%
20	Training Program PSI/Investigator	100%
21	Training Program Support Staff	100%
21	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	21.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Data Manager/Quality Assurance	1	4.76%	1.00
Director	1	4.76%	1.00
Investigator	9	42.86%	9.00
Regional Protective Services Coordinator	5	23.81%	5.00
Support Staff	2	9.52%	2.00
Training Program Manager	1	4.76%	1.00
Training Program PSI/Investigator	1	4.76%	1.00
Training Program Support Staff	1	4.76%	1.00
TOTAL	21	100.00%	21.00

STATE SUMMARY ► OREGON APS

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Abuse Prevention Coordinator	100%
2	APS Program Coordinator	100%
3	Section Manager	100%
4	Support Staff, Abuse Prevention	100%
5	Support Staff, APS	50%
5	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	4.50

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Abuse Prevention Coordinator	1	20.00%	1.00
APS Program Coordinator	1	20.00%	1.00
Section Manager	1	20.00%	1.00
Support Staff, Abuse Prevention	1	20.00%	1.00
Support Staff, APS	1	20.00%	0.50
TOTAL	5	100.00%	4.50

STATE SUMMARY ► PENNSYLVANIA EPS

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
INA	INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE	INA
INA	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	INA

NOTES ► • "There is no APS staff as such. The various functions are dispersed throughout the organization. Policy and regulation in one person, clinical consultation as part of 6 others, appeals in several others. FTE's are not known."

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE	INA	INA	INA
TOTAL	INA	INA	INA

STATE SUMMARY ► RHODE ISLAND

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Computer	100%
2	Coordinator	100%
3	Intake	100%
4	Social Worker	100%
5	Social Worker	100%
6	Social Worker	100%
7	Social Worker	100%
8	Social Worker	100%
9	Social Worker	100%
10	Social Worker	100%
11	Social Worker	100%
11	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	11.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE – RHODE ISLAND	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Computer	1	9.09%	1.00
Coordinator	1	9.09%	1.00
Intake	1	9.09%	1.00
Social Worker	8	72.73%	8.00
TOTAL	11	100%	11.00

STATE SUMMARY ► SOUTH CAROLINA

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Administrative Assistant	100%
2	Administrative Assistant	100%
3	Program Coordinator I	100%
4	Program Coordinator I	100%
5	Program Coordinator I	100%
6	Program Coordinator II	100%
6	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	6.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Assistant	1	33.33%	2.00
Program Coordinator I	1	50.00%	3.00
Program Coordinator II	1	16.67%	1.00
TOTAL	6	100.00%	6.00

STATE SUMMARY ► SOUTH DAKOTA

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
INA	INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE	INA
INA	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	INA

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE	INA	INA	INA
TOTAL	INA	INA	INA

STATE SUMMARY ► TENNESSEE

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Administrative Secretary	100%
2	Community Service Assistant	100%
3	Community Service Assistant	100%
4	Community Service Assistant	100%
5	Community Service Assistant	100%
6	Community Service Assistant	100%
7	Community Service Assistant	100%
8	Community Service Assistant	100%
9	Community Service Assistant	100%
10	Field Supervisor	100%
11	Field Supervisor	100%
12	Field Supervisor	100%
13	Field Supervisor	100%
14	Field Supervisor	100%
15	Field Supervisor	100%
16	Field Supervisor	100%
17	Field Supervisor	100%
18	Field Supervisor	100%
19	Field Supervisor	100%
20	Field Supervisor	100%
21	Field Supervisor	100%
22	Field Supervisor	100%
23	Human Services Program Supervisors	100%
24	Human Services Program Supervisors	100%
25	Human Services Program Supervisors	100%
26	Program Coordinator	100%
27	Program Coordinator	100%
28	Program Director	100%
29	Secretary	100%
30	Secretary	100%
31	Secretary	100%
32	Secretary	100%
33	Secretary	100%
34	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
35	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
36	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
37	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
38	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
39	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
40	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
41	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
42	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
43	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
44	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
45	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
46	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
47	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – TENNESSEE Continued	
48	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
49	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
50	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
51	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
52	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
53	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
54	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
55	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
56	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
57	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
58	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
59	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
60	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
61	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
62	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
63	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
64	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
65	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
66	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
67	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
68	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
69	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
70	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
71	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
72	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
73	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
74	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
75	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
76	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
77	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
78	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
79	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
80	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
81	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
82	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
83	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
84	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
85	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
86	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
87	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
88	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
89	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
90	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
91	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
92	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
93	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
94	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
95	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – TENNESSEE Continued	FTE %
96	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
97	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
98	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
99	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
100	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
101	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
102	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
103	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
104	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
105	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
106	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
107	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
108	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
109	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
110	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
111	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
112	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
113	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
114	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
115	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
116	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
117	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
118	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
119	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
120	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
121	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
122	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
123	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
124	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
125	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
126	Social Counselor II (Investigative)	100%
126	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	126.00

NOTES ►

● NONE

POSITION TITLE – TENNESSEE Continued	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Secretary	1	0.79%	1.00
Community Service Assistant	8	6.35%	8.00
Field Supervisor	13	10.32%	13.00
Human Services Program Supervisors	3	2.38%	3.00
Program Coordinator	2	1.59%	2.00
Program Director	1	0.79%	1.00
Secretary	5	3.97%	5.00
Social Counselor II (Investigative)	93	73.81%	93.00
TOTAL	126	100%	126.00

STATE SUMMARY ► TEXAS

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Administrative Technician	100%
2	Administrative Technician	100%
3	Administrative Technician	100%
4	Budget and Planning	100%
5	Budget and Planning	100%
6	Business Services	100%
7	Director	100%
8	Division Administrator	100%
9	Division Administrator	100%
10	Information Technology	100%
11	Legal	100%
12	Legal	100%
13	Legal	100%
14	Legal	100%
15	Legal	100%
16	Legal	100%
17	Legal	100%
18	Legal	100%
19	Legal	100%
20	Ombudsman	100%
21	Other Management	100%
22	Other Management	76%
23	Professional Development	100%
24	Professional Development	100%
25	Professional Development	100%
26	Professional Development	100%
27	Professional Development	100%
28	Program Specialist	100%
29	Program Specialist	100%
30	Program Specialist	100%
31	Program Specialist	100%
32	Program Specialist	100%
33	Program Specialist	100%
34	Program Specialist	100%
35	Program Specialist	100%
36	Program Specialist	100%
37	Program Specialist	100%
38	Program Specialist	100%
39	Program Specialist	100%
40	Program Specialist	100%
41	Program Specialist	100%
42	Program Specialist	100%
43	Program Specialist	100%
44	Program Specialist	100%
45	Program Specialist	100%
46	Quality Assurance Coordinator	100%

#	POSITION TITLE – TEXAS Continued	FTE %
47	SWI Hotline	100%
48	SWI Hotline	100%
49	SWI Hotline	100%
50	SWI Hotline	100%
51	SWI Hotline	100%
52	SWI Hotline	100%
53	SWI Hotline	100%
54	SWI Hotline	100%
55	SWI Hotline	100%
56	SWI Hotline	100%
57	SWI Hotline	100%
58	SWI Hotline	100%
59	SWI Hotline	100%
60	SWI Hotline	100%
61	SWI Hotline	100%
62	SWI Hotline	100%
63	SWI Hotline	100%
64	SWI Hotline	100%
65	SWI Hotline	100%
66	SWI Hotline	100%
67	SWI Hotline	100%
68	SWI Hotline	100%
69	SWI Hotline	100%
70	SWI Hotline	100%
71	SWI Hotline	100%
72	SWI Hotline	100%
73	SWI Hotline	100%
74	SWI Hotline	100%
74	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	73.76

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE – TEXAS Continued	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Administrative Technician	3	4.05%	3.00
Budget and Planning	2	2.70%	2.00
Business Services	1	1.35%	1.00
Director	1	1.35%	1.00
Division Administrator	2	2.70%	2.00
Information Technology	1	1.35%	1.00
Legal	9	12.16%	9.00
Ombudsman	1	1.35%	1.00
Other Management	2	2.70%	1.76
Professional Development	5	6.76%	5.00
Program Specialist	18	24.32%	18.00
Quality Assurance Coordinator	1	1.35%	1.00
SWI Hotline	28	37.84%	28.00
TOTAL	74	100.00%	73.76

STATE SUMMARY ► UTAH

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Accountant II	50%
2	APS Trainer	100%
3	Associate Director	100%
4	Manager, Support Services	100%
5	Training Technician	50%
5	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	4.00

NOTES ► • NONE

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Accountant II	1	20.00%	0.50
APS Trainer	1	20.00%	1.00
Associate Director	1	20.00%	1.00
Manager, Support Services	1	20.00%	1.00
Training Technician	1	20.00%	0.50
TOTAL	5.00	100.00%	4.00

STATE SUMMARY ► VERMONT

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Intake Specialist	100%
2	Investigative Social Worker	100%
3	Investigative Social Worker	100%
4	Investigative Social Worker	100%
5	Investigative Social Worker	100%
6	Investigative Social Worker	100%
7	Nurse Surveyor - Facility Reports	65%
8	Nurse Surveyor - Investigations	65%
9	Program Chief	50%
10	Screener / Investigative Social Worker	100%
10	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	8.80

NOTES ► • 1. "APS has two Nurse Surveyors (from our Licensing Unit) assigned to the APS unit re: screening of abuse allegations in licensed facilities and conducting investigations."
 2. We "share IT person, who is assigned to our Division."

POSITION TITLE - VERMONT	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Intake Specialist	1	10.00%	1.00
Investigative Social Worker	5	50.00%	5.00
Nurse Surveyor - Facility Reports	1	10.00%	0.65
Nurse Surveyor - Investigations	1	10.00%	0.65
Program Chief	1	10.00%	0.50
Screener / Investigative Social Worker	1	10.00%	1.00
TOTAL	10	100%	8.80

STATE SUMMARY ► VIRGINIA

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Adult Services Programs Consultant	100%
1	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	1.00

NOTES ► • "Position is currently vacant."

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Adult Services Programs Consultant	1	100%	1.00
TOTAL	1	100%	1.00

STATE SUMMARY ► WYOMING

#	POSITION TITLE	FTE %
1	Social Service Consultant	100%
1	< # Employees ----- TOTAL ----- # FTE >	1.00

NOTES ► • "Though I'm still doing work relative to CPS."

POSITION TITLE	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES PER POSITION	FTE EMPLOYEES PER POSITION
Social Service Consultant	1	100.00%	1.00
TOTAL	1	100.00%	1.00

Section E: Regional APS Programs

Thirty eight states responded to the question about whether their APS Program was divided into regional administrative units. Of those states, 23 (60%) reported that they were and 40% that they were not. See table on page 25 for more information on states' regional structures.

E.1. Is your state APS divided into administrative regions?

N=Total Number of Responses:	38	100.0%
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

STATES ► Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts APS, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS /Oregon APS, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

► Information Not Available:	0	0%
-------------------------------------	----------	-----------

STATES ► NONE

► Yes:	23	60.5%
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois EPS, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon EPS / Oregon APS, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES ►

- Arizona "Districts."
- Iowa "Service Areas - Not Regions."
- Oregon APS "See attached."

► No:	15	39.5%
--------------	-----------	--------------

STATES ► Alaska, California, DC, Georgia, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania EPS, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont.

NOTES ►

- Massachusetts APS "See Preliminary Note."
- Mississippi "There are no regional APS programs. The Division of Family and Children's Services has 9 regional offices, with one (1) regional director per region."
- New Hampshire "The State's APS responsibilities are centrally administered and carried out: in 12 geographic districts throughout the State by SW staff who are supervised locally by SW Supervisors; in 1 specialized central unit; in State Long Term Care Ombudsman."
- New York "Centrally Administered."

SUMMARY TABLE ►

RESPONSE	NUMBER #	PERCENT %
Information Not Available:	0	0%
Yes:	23	60.5%
No:	15	39.5%
TOTAL	38	100%



NAAPSA Baseline Study
Adult Protective Services Administrative Structures

March 2002

Survey Respondent:

Title:

Agency:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail:

IMPORTANT: If there is any information you have provided on this survey that you would like to remain confidential please check the CONFIDENTIAL box following your response to each question. The sources of confidential responses will not be identified in the final report.

A. Funding

1. What was the total Adult Protective Service Program funding allocation for your state during the most recent reporting year?

_____ Information Not Available Total Funding Allocation \$ _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2. Please provide funding allocation sources and amounts below.

- a. _____ Information Not Available
- b. _____ Social Services Block Grant \$ _____
- c. _____ Older Americans Act \$ _____
- d. _____ State Funds \$ _____
- e. _____ Local Funds \$ _____
- f. _____ Medicaid \$ _____
- g. _____ Other Funds (Please describe) \$ _____
- h. _____ Other Funds (Please describe) \$ _____
- i. _____ Other Funds (Please describe) \$ _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2.a. Since 2000 have SSBG funds for APS in your state been reduced?

_____ Information Not Available Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2.b. If yes, what was the total amount of APS SSBG funds lost?

_____ Information Not Available Amount \$ _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2.c. If yes, please describe the impact of this reduction on services to APS clients?

CONFIDENTIAL

B. APS Cases

1. Please provide the following information regarding the number of APS cases statewide at the close of the most recent reporting year.

Number of APS reports: _____ Information Not Available
Number of substantiated cases: _____ Information Not Available
Number of open/active cases: _____ Information Not Available
Number of cases closed: _____ Information Not Available

CONFIDENTIAL

C. Services Program Location

1. Please indicate the location that best describes where the State Administrative Agency for Elder / Adult Protective Services Program operates within your state.

- a. _____ Information Not Available
- b. _____ An independent state unit on aging.
- c. _____ State unit on aging located in the state's human service agency.
- d. _____ An organization within the human services agency that includes the state unit on aging.
- e. _____ An organization within the human services agency that does not include the state unit on aging.
- f. _____ An independent organization that is neither the human services nor state unit on aging.
- g. _____ A division/organizational unit within the Office of the Attorney General.
- h. _____ An administrative unit within the office of the state governor.
- i. _____ Local home based/contract workers who report to a central office.
- j. _____ Other (please describe). _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2. Are you able to provide an up-to-date organizational chart that identifies the position where the State Administrative Agency for Elder/Adult Protective Services Program operates within your state's structure?

_____ Information Not Available Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

§ If yes, please attach the most up-to-date organizational chart to your completed survey.

D. State APS Program Staffing

Using the grid provided below, please list the official title and full time equivalency (FTE) percentage for each State APS Program staff member. Please refer to your program’s organizational chart and, wherever possible, list staff titles in hierarchical order.

Staff Member #	Title	% FTE
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		

CONFIDENTIAL

Using the grid provided below, please indicate the percentage of time spent on the listed duties, tasks and responsibilities for each State APS Program staff member. Use the corresponding pre-assigned Staff Member # in question D. 1. to locate the appropriate column number for each State APS Program staff member for the table below.

Duties, Tasks and Responsibilities	Staff Member Number														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Administrator / Director															
Training															
Curriculum Development															
Data Management / Reports															
Grant Writing															
Legislative Liaison															
Public Relations															
Project Management															
Legal Counsel															
Administrative Support															
Direct Client Services															
Hot Line															
Accounting															
Information and Referrals															
Computer / MIS / Technical															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
TOTAL % TIME	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Duties, Tasks and Responsibilities	Staff Member Number														
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Administrator / Director															
Training															
Curriculum Development															
Data Management / Reports															
Grant Writing															
Legislative Liaison															
Public Relations															
Project Management															
Legal Counsel															
Administrative Support															
Direct Client Services															
Hot Line															
Accounting															
Information and Referrals															
Computer / MIS / Technical															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
Other:															
TOTAL % TIME	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

NO
TE:
Con
tinu
e
here
for
stat
e
APS
staff
s
cons
istin
g of
16
or
mor
e
emp
love
es

CONF
IDEN
TIAL

E.

Re
gio
nal
AP
S
Pr
og
ra
ms

1.
Is

your state APS divided into administrative regions?

_____ Information Not Available Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

1.a. If yes, how many administrative regions exist in your state?

_____ Information Not Available **Number of Regions:** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

1.b. If yes in question E.1., please complete the grid provided below to indicate the number of full-time, part-time and total number of staff working in each specific region within your state.

Region #	Region Name or Identifier	FTE Staff	Part-Time Staff	Total Staff
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
Total Regional APS Staff				

CONFIDENTIAL

F. Local APS Programs

Please indicate the total number of local APS programs at each of the following levels:

- a. _____ Information Not Available
- b. _____ **City**
- c. _____ **County**
- d. _____ **Other 1 (Please Describe):** _____
- _____ **Other 2 (Please Describe):** _____
- _____ **Other 3 (Please Describe):** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

1.a. Referring to the totals for each specific local level in question F.1., please use the grid provided below to indicate where local APS programs are housed?

Location of Local APS Programs	City	County	Other 1	Other 2	Other 3
<i>Information Not Available</i>					
Local Area Agencies on Aging					
County Agencies on Aging					
Local Human/Social Services Agencies					
County Human/Social Services Agencies					
Other Agency 1 (Please Describe)					
Other Agency 2 (Please Describe)					
Other Agency 3 (Please Describe)					

Other Agency 1 (Described): _____
 Other Agency 2 (Described): _____
 Other Agency 3 (Described): _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2. Please use the grid provided below to indicate the distribution of all APS staff at the local level:

Local APS Staff Positions	# of Full Time	# of Part Time	Information Not Available
Directors / Administrators			
Supervisors			
Legal Counsel			

Unpaid Volunteers			
Trainers			
Curriculum Development Specialists			
Data Management / Reports Specialists			
Grant Writers			
Legislative Liaisons			
Public Relation Specialists			
Project Managers			
Administrative Support Staff			
Direct Casework Providers			
Interns			
Other Staff (Please Describe)			
Other Staff (Please Describe)			
Other Staff (Please Describe)			
Total Local Staff			

CONFIDENTIAL

2.a. Of the total local casework staff, how many are full-time APS workers with no other program assignments?

_____ *Information Not Available* Number of Staff: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

2.b. Of the total local casework staff, how many are part-time APS workers with no other program assignments?

_____ *Information Not Available* Number of Staff: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

2.c. Of the total local casework staff, how many are part-time APS workers and have other program assignments?

_____ *Information Not Available* Number of Staff: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

2.c.1. For part-time local APS casework staff, what are their other program assignments? (Please check all that apply)

- a. _____ *Information Not Available*
- b. _____ **Assistance Payments Programs**
- c. _____ **Home Health / Homemaker Services**
- d. _____ **Long Term Care Ombudsman**
- e. _____ **Employment Programs (Including TANF)**
- f. _____ **Medicaid / Medicare Eligibility**
- g. _____ **Other (Please Describe):** _____
- h. _____ **Other (Please Describe):** _____
- i. _____ **Other (Please Describe):** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2.d. Of the **local APS direct casework staff**, please use the grid below to indicate how many specialized workers there are in each the following areas and what are their average caseloads?

Area of Specialization	Number of Workers	Average Caseload	Information Not Available
Intake			
Area of Specialization	Number of Workers	Average Caseload	Information Not Available
Investigation			
Ongoing Casework			
Case Management			
General with Mixed APS Cases Only			
Court Related Casework			
Other (Please Describe)			
Other (Please Describe)			
Other (Please Describe)			

CONFIDENTIAL

3. Do you have volunteers who are assigned to APS units?

_____ Information Not Available Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

3.a. If yes, what are their duties? (Please describe)

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____

f. Information Not Available

CONFIDENTIAL

4. What is the average ratio of local APS Caseworkers to APS supervisors?

_____ Information Not Available Caseworkers _____ to _____ Supervisors

CONFIDENTIAL

5. Do you have caseload standards?

_____ Information Not Available Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

If yes, please attach a copy of the caseload standards to your completed survey.

6. Which APS direct client services are provided at the local level? (Please check all that apply)

- a. _____ Information Not Available
- b. _____ Receiving reports of abuse, exploitation and neglect.
- c. _____ Providing information and referral.
- d. _____ Conducting investigations of reports.
- e. _____ Assessing client risk.
- f. _____ Developing a case plan.
- g. _____ Arranging for the provision of client support services.
- h. _____ Monitoring support services.
- i. _____ Providing direct counseling to clients and/or caregivers.
- j. _____ Initiating guardianship proceedings.
- k. _____ Acting as court ordered guardians and/or conservators.
- l. _____ Providing bill paying services upon client's request.
- m. _____ Arranging for residential placement.

- n. _____ **Monitoring residential placements.**
- o. _____ **Disposing of client's possessions after placement or death.**
- p. _____ **Assisting with resident relocations during facility closure.**
- q. _____ **Making funeral and burial arrangements for clients.**
- r. _____ **Other (Please Describe)** _____
- s. _____ **Other (Please Describe)** _____
- t. _____ **Other (Please Describe)** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

G. Program Oversight

1. Which administrative / supervisory structure applies to APS programs in your state?

- a. _____ *Information Not Available*
- b. _____ **State supervised, locally administered**
- c. _____ **Regionally supervised, locally administered**
- d. _____ **State supervised and administered**
- e. _____ **Other (Please Describe)** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2. What roles / functions does the state APS agency carry out in relation to local programs? (Please check all that apply)

- a. _____ *Information Not Available*
- b. _____ **Collects client data**
- c. _____ **Issues state wide reports**
- d. _____ **Sets policies and protocols**
- e. _____ **Monitors/evaluates**
- f. _____ **Provides training**
- g. _____ **Provides case consultation**
- h. _____ **Initiates/revises state statutes and regulations**
- i. _____ **Other (Please Describe)** _____

CONFIDENTIAL

3. Does the state have the authority to sanction local programs for non-compliance with state laws and regulations?

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

3.a. If yes, what sanctions may the state impose? (Please describe)

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

H. Program Evaluation

1. Has the state developed outcome measures for program evaluation?

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

1.a. If yes, what are the outcomes that are measured?

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

1.b. If yes, how are outcomes measured? (Please describe or attach)

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

1.c. If yes, how often are outcomes measured? _____

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

2. What other quality control measures are used in your state? (Please describe)

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

I. Community Cooperation and Collaboration

1. The state APS program has written Memos of Understanding with the following other state agencies regarding responsibilities for the coordination and provision of abuse reports and Adult Protective Services. (Please list)

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

2. Local Adult Protective Services programs have written Memos of Understanding with the following local agencies regarding responsibilities for the provision of APS at the local level. (Please list)

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

3. There is a state interagency coalition or coordinating committee that meets regularly to develop/discuss policy issues relating to abused adults.

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

4. There are local APS interagency teams which meet to share resources and cooperate in the provision of direct services to local APS clients.

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

4.a. If yes, how many local teams? _____

_____ *Information Not Available*

CONFIDENTIAL

5. There are statutory requirements for abuse cross reporting by other agencies.

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

6. There are statutory requirements for the formation of local APS interdisciplinary teams.

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____

CONFIDENTIAL

J. Public Awareness

1. Please use the grid provided below to identify what efforts have been made at the state and local level to increase awareness of adult / elder abuse and reporting requirements? (Please check all that apply)

Public Awareness Efforts	Local Level	State Level	Information Not Available
Advertisements in Newspapers and Publications			
Billboards			
Brochures			
Cross Training with other Professionals			
Newspaper Articles			
Press Releases			
Public Service Announcements			
Radio Announcements			
Speaking Engagements			
Television Public Awareness Programs			
Videos			
Other (Please Describe)			
Other (Please Describe)			
Other (Please Describe)			

CONFIDENTIAL

K. Worker Safety Issues

1. Using the grid provided below, please rank the following safety issues by level of occurrence as encountered and reported by APS staff in the field with (1) being the most frequent, (2) being less frequent, etc... For Field Safety Issues that do not apply, please enter NA for non applicable.

APS Worker Field Safety Issues	Rank
Dangerous animals	
Dangerous neighborhoods	
Display of weapons by clients or perpetrators – i.e. guns, knives, etc	
Exposure to contagious diseases – i.e. tuberculosis	
Physical assault by clients or perpetrators	
Sexual assault by clients or perpetrators	
Sexual harassment by clients or perpetrators	
Stalking behavior by clients or perpetrators	
Threats of physical violence by clients or perpetrators	
Unsafe housing - leaking gas, broken floorboards, etc	
Unsanitary housing conditions - Trash filled houses	
Other (Please Describe)	
Other (Please Describe)	

2. Have APS staff in your state ever been physically injured in the performance of their duties while in the field?
_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

2.a. If yes, please list or describe what types of injuries have been reported?

3. Have APS staff in your state ever filed Workers Compensation claims?
_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

3.a. If yes, how many Workers Compensation claims were filed in the past reporting year?

_____ *Information Not Available* Number of Claims: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

4. Do APS workers receive regular training on worker safety issues?
_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

4.a. If yes, do you have a standardized worker safety curriculum that you would be willing to share?

_____ *Information Not Available* Yes: _____ No: _____ CONFIDENTIAL

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in completing this survey.

Please return the completed survey and all relevant attachments by:
Friday, April 19, 2002

Completed surveys should be faxed or mailed to:

(303)-443-3361

**Joanne Otto
Executive Director
NAAPSA
960 Lincoln Place
Boulder, CO 80302**

NAPSA

2007 Update of State APS Structure Survey

Just check or fill in as appropriate.

1. State: _____ Your name: _____

2. Is APS in your state located within:

_____ Human Services Agency _____ State Unit on Aging

_____ Other (name, please): _____

3. Has the State APS Program been transferred within your state since 2002? If yes, was the transfer:

_____ from the state unit on aging to the state human services department

_____ from the state human services department to the state unit on aging

_____ Other: From: _____

To: _____

4. Are APS direct services in your state provided by:

_____ state employees

_____ county employees

_____ area agencies on aging

_____ other not-for-profit and/or local public agencies

_____ other (describe): _____

5. Any additional information or comments you'd like to provide:

Please save and email ASAP to: kathleen.quinn@apsnetwork.org.

THANK YOU!