



SURVEY REPORT

State Adult Protective Services Program Responses to Financial Exploitation of Vulnerable Adults 2003

A Report Prepared for
The National Center on Elder Abuse
July 2003

REPORT ON

STATE ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES

RESPONSES TO FINANCIAL

EXPLOITATION OF

VULNERABLE ADULTS

2003

**This Report was prepared By Joanne Otto, Executive Director
Patricia Ianni Stanis, Ph.D., and Kevin W. Marlatt, consultants
for the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators,
a partner of the National Center on Elder Abuse
The Report was supported by a grant No. 90-AP-2144
From the Administration on Aging
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**

THE NATIONAL CENTER ON ELDER ABUSE

The National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) is administered by the National Association of State Units on Aging as the lead agency and funded by grant No. 90-AP-2144 from the U.S. Administration on Aging. NCEA consists of a consortium of six partner organizations.

NCEA exists to provide elder abuse information to professionals and the public; offer technical assistance and training to elder abuse agencies and related professionals; conduct short-term elder abuse research; and assist with elder abuse program and policy development. NCEA's website and clearinghouse contain many resources and publications to help achieve these goals.

PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

Sara Aravanis, Director
National Center on Elder Abuse
National Association State Units
on Aging
1201 15th Street, NW, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20005-2800
(202) 898-2586 / Fax: (202) 898-2583
NCEA@nasua.org

Karen Stein, Director
Clearinghouse on Abuse and
Neglect of the Elderly (CANE)
Department of Consumer Studies
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
(302) 831-3525 / Fax: (302) 831-6081
kstein@udel.edu

Mary Twomey, Director
Elder Abuse Prevention Program
Goldman Institute on Aging
3330 Geary Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94118
(415) 750-4180 / Fax: (415) 750-4136
mtwomey@gioa.org

Lori Stiegel, Associate Staff Director
Commission on Legal Problems
of the Elderly
American Bar Association
740 15th Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-1022
(202) 662-8692 / Fax: (202) 662-8698
lstiegel@staff.abanet.org

Ricker Hamilton, President
National Association of Adult Protective
Services Administrators
DHS/Bureau of Elder/Adult Services
161 Marginal Way
Portland, ME
(207) 822-2150 / Fax: (207) 822-2162
ricker.hamilton@state.me.us

Bob Blancato, President
National Committee for the
Prevention of Elder Abuse
c/o Matz, Blancato & Associates
1101 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1001
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 789-0470 / Fax: (202) 682-3984
msbrb@erols.com

National Center on Elder Abuse

1201 15th Street, NW, Suite 350 - Washington, DC - 20005-2800
(202) 898-2586 – Fax: (202) 898-2583 – NCEA@nasua.org –
www.elderabusecenter.org

REPORT ON STATE'S ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES RESPONSES TO FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF VULNERABLE ADULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This survey was conducted by the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators (NAAPSA) in 2001. Thirty-four states and Guam responded to the survey. Twenty-eight states reported receiving a total of 38,015 reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults during their most recent reporting year.

Out of 35 respondents, 29 states (83%) said that they had a mandatory reporting statute that included financial exploitation. Eleven (33.9%) indicated that financial institutions were included as mandatory reporters and seventeen (48.6%) indicated that reporting by financial institutions was voluntary.

Of the reports of financial exploitation that were received by APS in 15 states, only 45 (0.3%) were made by banks. More than half of the victims, (58.4%), were female, and the majority, (64.7%), were age 66 or older. Seven states indicated that they thought financially exploited victims had higher incomes than other APS clients. Other states commented that while client incomes varied greatly, income of financial exploitation victims was similar to that of other APS clients but that their assets were greater; that property and resources were targeted by the perpetrators more often than funds, and that income was less of a factor than the perpetrator's access to the victim.

While twenty-four states reported having some sort of Multi-Disciplinary Teams which specifically addressed issues of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults, only 14.3% said that banks were represented on state level teams or coalitions, and 8.6% indicated that banks were usually or always represented on similar local groups.

Out of 35 states reporting, 30 (85.7%) indicated that training on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults was available to APS workers. Half the states used state funding for training and nine states mentioned Social Service Block Grant funds.

When states were asked to assign a qualitative rating to several agencies in terms of their levels of response to APS cases of financial exploitation, state Attorneys General and law enforcement had the highest ratings. Cross training with law enforcement, prosecutors and judges was identified as the most effective method of improving the relationships between APS and other professionals.

A significant number of financial institutions are still not reporting even when they are mandated by state statute to do so. Special efforts need to be made to involve all professional financial service providers in the process of identifying and reducing financial exploitation. In addition to involving them directly on collaborative state and community groups, financial institutions should be included in state reporting laws. Their staff should receive training on an ongoing basis about their role in identifying and reporting financial exploitation

As in other areas of the Baseline Study, the lack of reliable data creates very real obstacles to program credibility. Research is needed on the amount of financial loss to victims, as well as the fiscal impact on public benefit programs when these victims are no longer financially self-sufficient. The number of financial exploitation reports being made to APS and anecdotal information about the increasing complexity of these cases result in the need for a more coordinated and educated response.

Of
**REPORT ON STATES' ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES
RESPONSES TO FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF
VULNERABLE ADULTS**

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ADULT PROTECTIVE
SERVICES ADMINISTRATORS
FOR THE NATIONAL CENTER ON ELDER ABUSE**

July 2003

INTRODUCTION

A decade ago, the *New York Times* ran a front-page article on financial abuse of the elderly.¹ In the article, exploitation of the elderly was called "the crime of the 90s". Unfortunately, although the 90's have come and gone, the problem continues to grow. A study of 39 states conducted by the National Center on Elder Abuse in 1994 showed that there were 29,643 reports of financial/material exploitation of the elderly in domestic settings made to state Adult Protective Services (APS) programs that year.² In a new survey conducted by the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators (NAAPSA) in 2001, 28 states reported receiving a total of 38,015 reports of financial exploitation of elderly and vulnerable younger adults during their most recent reporting year.

The number of reports of financial exploitation has led to increased attention to the problem at the state and federal level. Some examples of state initiatives include State Attorneys General in Massachusetts and Oregon who developed training for financial institutions in an effort to gain their cooperation in reporting and preventing financial exploitation of older persons. And in Colorado, Attorney General Ken Salazar initiated "AARP Senior Watch" in order to combat the financial exploitation of the elderly.

At the federal level, a national symposium led by the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services was held in the fall of 2000. This conference highlighted a number of innovative approaches to financial exploitation and prosecution being carried out by various states. Recently, pursuant to the Older Americans Act, the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has convened a group of federal agencies and concerned stakeholders to design a study of financial exploitation.

In preparation for the HHS study, and as part of its commitment to conduct a Baseline Study of States' Adult Protective Services Programs, NAAPSA, a partner in the National Center on Elder Abuse, completed this survey of states' APS programs to determine their current responses to cases of financial exploitation of elder and disabled adults.

¹ Nordheimer, Jon, "A New Abuse of the Elderly: Theft by Kin and Friends" *New York Times* 12/16/91. pp 1,16 .

² Tatara, Toshio and Blumerman, Lisa M., "Summaries of the Statistical Data on Elder Abuse in Domestic Settings: An Exploratory study of State Statistics for FY 93 and FY 94", National Center on Elder Abuse, Washington, D.C., July 1996 pp. 16-21.

This paper will present the study's methodology and findings, and then discuss these findings and their policy implications.

METHODOLOGY

In the fall of 2001, a four-page questionnaire was developed in collaboration with Patricia Ianni Stanis, Ph.D., an APS consultant. A letter and copy of the questionnaire were sent to all fifty state APS administrators, as well as the District of Columbia and the U.S. territories. Thirty-three states and the territory of Guam responded to the survey. Data from the surveys were entered on Excel spreadsheets and analyzed.

FINDINGS

Sources of data

Out of the 35 respondents to this item, 23 indicated that the information they used to complete the survey was from their most recent fiscal year. ("Fiscal Year" was not defined, as it differs from state to state.) Eight states used data from the most recent full calendar year. A previous NAAPSA report, "State Adult Protective Services Data Management Systems 2001" showed that many states lacked comprehensive APS data management systems, often making it impossible to provide some of the information requested in this current study.

Reports/cases of financial exploitation

Out of 35 respondents, 29 states (83%) said that they had a mandatory reporting statute that included financial exploitation. Six (17%) states did not include financial exploitation in their mandatory reporting statute, and none of the states had a mandatory reporting statute that referred only to the reporting of financial exploitation.

Eleven (33.9%) of the 29 states with mandatory reporting indicated that financial institutions were included as mandatory reporters. Seventeen out of 35 states (48.6%) indicated that reporting by financial institutions was voluntary.

Out of 15 states with a total of 18,476 financial exploitation reports received by APS in the past year, the number of referrals and sources were as following:

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------|
| • Banks | 54 | (0.3%) |
| • Prosecutors/district attorneys | 87 | (0.5%) |
| • Law enforcement | 614 | (3.3%) |
| • Other sources | 17,721 | (95.9%) |

Only 12 of the 15 states were able to identify how many of those exploitation reports to APS had been substantiated (4,626) as follows:

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------|
| • Banks | 24 | (0.5%) |
| • Prosecutors/district attorneys | 23 | (0.5%) |
| • Law enforcement | 209 | (4.5%) |
| • Other | 4,370 | (94.5%) |

Sixteen states indicated that APS had made a total of 2,846 reports of financial exploitation to law enforcement. Twelve states said that APS made 1,152 reports to prosecutors and district attorneys.

Twenty-five (74%) of the states responding to the survey reported that they did not have a registry for perpetrators of financial exploitation. Ten states with such a registry said that their perpetrator registries included the following:

Financial/client information

Twenty-eight states indicated a total of 38,015 cases of financial exploitation were reported to APS during the last reporting period. The remainder of the states said that these data were not available.

According to 15 reporting states, 41.6% of the victims of financial exploitation were male and 58.4% were female. Twelve states reported that the ages of the victims fell into the following categories:

Thirty-five states responded to the question regarding income levels of substantiated victims of financial exploitation as compared to the income levels of other APS clients. Of these, 7 states indicated that they thought financially exploited victims had higher incomes than other APS clients, 11 thought that the victims had similar incomes to those of other APS clients and none thought they had lower incomes than other APS clients. Fourteen states said that they were unable to answer this question.

Four of the responding states commented that while client incomes varied greatly, income of financial exploitation victims was similar to that of other APS clients but their assets were greater; that property and resources were targeted by the perpetrators more often than funds, and that income was less of a factor than the perpetrator's access to the victim.

Only one state, Oregon was able to provide an estimate of the statewide total value of assets involved in 47 substantiated cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults—the estimate was from \$50,001 to \$100,000.

Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs)

Twenty-four states reported having some sort of MDT to specifically address issues of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults. Typically, Multi-Disciplinary Teams are made up of professionals within a community who review cases of alleged adult/elder abuse, exploitation or neglect and make recommendations regarding possible treatment alternatives and resources which could reduce further victim risk. Three states (12.5%) said that they had statewide MDTs, 14 (58.3%) had local MDTs and 5 (20.8%) had Fiduciary Abuse Specialist Teams (FAST). Fifteen states (62.5%) reported having other types of teams such as community partnerships for preventing elder abuse, local elder abuse councils, governor-appointed task forces, state legal services developers, partnerships between bankers and APS, Medicaid Fraud/APS collaborative groups, case consultation teams and state financial abuse teams.

Out of 35 states reporting on whether banks and other financial institutions were represented on state APS coalitions, 5 (14.3%) said that banks were represented, 24 (68.6%) said that they were not, and 6 (17.1%) did not have this information.

Eleven states out of 35 did not have information about local coalitions in their state. The remaining 24 reported the following:

- Banks were always represented on local MDTs 1 (2.9%)
- Banks were usually represented on local MDTs 2 (5.7%)
- Banks were sometimes represented on local MDTs 7 (20.0%)
- Banks were rarely represented on local MDTs 9 (25.7%)
- Banks were never represented on local MDTs 5 (14.3%)

Training and Funding

Out of 35 states reporting, 30 (85.7%) indicated that training on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults was available to APS workers, 4 (11.4%) said such training was not available, and one state was not able to answer the question. According to 30 states reporting, training on financial exploitation was usually provided by the following:

- State APS staff 21 (70%)
- Law enforcement staff 8 (26.7%)
- Prosecutors and district attorneys 8 (26.7%)
- County APS staff 4 (13.3%)
- F.A.S.T. team members 2 (6.7%)
- University staff 1 (3.3%)
- Coalition/consortium staff 1 (3.3%)

(This current study on financial exploitation failed to include bank employees as training resources on financial exploitation. A 2002 NAAPSA report on State Adult Protective Services Training Programs found that out of 36 states responding, 24 (68.6%) reported having cross training with bank employees.)

Other sources of training on financial exploitation mentioned by states included NAAPSA; legal services developers, Medicaid fraud staff, local aging staff, Attorneys General, elder law experts and other consultants.

Eight states said that they did not have specific information on funding sources for APS training on financial exploitation. Eighteen states used state funding, nine states mentioned Social Service Block Grant funds, two states relied on local funds, and nine talked about other sources of training money, including Administration on Aging funds, Title 19 Medicaid, and conference registration fees. None of the states was able to provide a dollar amount allocated for such training.

Measuring and improving responses to financial exploitation

States were asked to assign a qualitative rating to a number of agencies in terms of their levels of response to APS cases of financial exploitation. The rating scale included no response (1), minimal (2), average (3), above average (4) and outstanding (5). The results of 32 states' ratings expressed as averages are as follows:

- State Attorneys General 2.9
- Law enforcement (Police/Sheriff) 2.7
- Bank Officials 2.4
- District Attorneys 2.2
- Judges 2.2
- County/Parish Attorneys³ 1.9

Four states indicated that other agencies also responded to these cases. Connecticut gave high marks (4) to their Office of the Chief State's Attorney, while Texas gave their Social Security Administration a 1--"no response."

In terms of what would improve APS responses to financial exploitation, out of 33 states, the following were listed:

- Cross training with other disciplines 29 (87.8%)
- More staff and resources for APS programs 28 (84.8%)
- Collaborative support from MDTs 13 (39.4%)
- Training for other agencies 32 (97.0%)

Thirty-two responding states said that the following agencies or entities needed training on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults:

- Banks 30 (93.8%)
- Law enforcement 29 (90.6%)
- Prosecutors and district attorneys 26 (81.3%)
- Judges 25 (78.1%)
- Public notaries 14 (45.2%)
- Real estate agents/brokers 13 (40.6%)
- County/parish attorneys 13 (40.6%)
- Title company staff 11 (35.5%)

³ The state of Louisiana is divided into parishes instead of counties.

Seven states listed other groups that would also benefit from training, including: estate planners; stock brokers; credit card lenders; Social Security Administration; state court system, elder law attorneys, lawyers; Area Agencies on Aging, Legal Services Providers and the medical community.

In addition, 33 states indicated that improvement in the working relationship between APS and law enforcement would be likely if the following elements were available:

- Cross training 29 (87.8%)
- More staff and resources for law enforcement 21 (63.6%)
- Collaborative support from MDTs during investigations 19 (57.6%).

Other elements that would be helpful include:

- Creation of specialized law enforcement financial exploitation units
- Cooperation across state lines on interstate cases
- Training for law enforcement staff on interviewing victims
- A national database of perpetrators
- A willingness to prosecute smaller amounts of financial loss
- More APS staff specializing in financial exploitation

In terms of what would enhance the relationship between APS and prosecutors/district attorneys, 34 states responded with the following:

- Cross training of prosecutors and district attorneys 31 (91.2%)
- Collaborative support from MDTs during investigations 18 (52.9%)
- More staff and resources for criminal justice agencies 17 (50.0%)

Nine states also mentioned other actions that would enhance the relationship between APS and prosecutors/district attorneys, including: making these cases a priority; training on how to get credible testimony from impaired victims; specialized APS staff with expertise in financial exploitation cases; prosecutors who specialize in cases of financial exploitation; and improved laws relating to Social Security representative payeeships and powers of attorney.

Finally, 33 states indicated that the working relationship between APS and judges in responding to cases of financial exploitation could be improved by:

- Cross training with judges 28 (84.8%)
- Collaborative support from MDTs 12 (36.4%)
- More resources for criminal justice agencies 12 (36.4%)

In addition, 6 states mentioned other activities such as training for judges on the dynamics of aging and the fact that family members may be perpetrators; collaboration between judges and APS staff; and the use of mediation in lieu of court intervention to resolve disputes.

A few states recommended that the role of NAAPSA in the improvement of the APS system include: taking a lead in developing training materials for state APS programs;

conducting a national media campaign; providing national recognition for people doing exceptional work in the field; continuing to lobby on behalf of APS programs; testifying at Congressional hearings and providing technical assistance to the states.

DISCUSSION

If 28 states and one territory are receiving an average of 1,358 reports of financial exploitation annually, it is likely that the number of reports made to all the states could be as high as 69,258 every year. And if, as Karl Pillemer and David Finkelhor found in 1989, only 1 out of every 14 cases of elder abuse is reported, it is possible that there are as many as 969,612 (14 X 69,258) elderly and vulnerable adult victims of financial exploitation every year.⁴

However, a significant number of financial institutions are still not reporting even when they are mandated by state statute to do so. According to 15 reporting states, only 0.3% of their 18,746 reports of financial exploitation of elderly and vulnerable adults came from financial institutions. This low finding is consistent with information from the 1994 NCEA study that also showed that banks were the reporting entities in only 0.3% of elder abuse cases.⁵

At the same time, APS programs made only 3,998 reports of financial exploitation to law enforcement or prosecutors. When APS did make reports of financial exploitation to both law enforcement and district attorneys, the survey did not ask how many of these reports were prosecuted successfully.

In the few states that do have registries for perpetrators of financial exploitation, few data are collected. This limits the usefulness of such registries, but may be a reflection of states' concerns about confidentiality and the need to avoid litigation.

The finding that 58.4% of the victims of financial exploitation are female and 41.6% are male is similar to Tatar's findings in 1994.⁶ Apparently women, either due to their longevity or dependence—or a combination of these factors—continue to be more vulnerable to financial exploitation than men.

The lack of data regarding the value of assets lost through financial exploitation means that states are unable to describe the fiscal impact on victims of these crimes. It appears from the states' comments that the victims' income level was less important than the value of other assets, and that access by the perpetrator was a key element. This means that perpetrators are more likely to be friends or family who have a

⁴ Pillemer, K., and Finkelhor, D. 1989. "The Prevalence of Elder Abuse: A Random Sample Study" *Gerontologist* 28(1): 51-7.

⁵ Tatar, T. and Blumerman, L. M., "Summaries of the Statistical Data on Elder Abuse in Domestic Settings: An Exploratory study of State Statistics for FY 93 and FY 94", National Center on Elder Abuse, Washington, D.C., July 1996 p. 34.

⁶ Tatar, T. and Blumerman, L. M., "Summaries of the Statistical Data on Elder Abuse in Domestic Settings: An Exploratory study of State Statistics for FY 93 and FY 94", National Center on Elder Abuse, Washington, D.C., July 1996 p. 38.

relationship of trust with the victim—a finding that has been supported by other research studies.⁷

It is apparent that Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT) of some sort exist at both the state and local levels in many parts of the country. However it also appears that banks and financial institutions are seldom included on these teams. This is a significant problem, since MDTs perform an important function in educating the professionals on the team about abuse reporting requirements. The absence of banks on many of these teams may account in part for their low level of reporting.

The need for cross training with a variety of other professionals was an often-repeated theme. While training was provided to many APS staff, most of that training was provided by state APS staff who may or may not have expertise in financial exploitation. The majority of the states indicated that APS training is provided through state funding or a combination of state and SSBG funds. Recent reductions in both these sources may mean that there will be less APS training available. Travel restrictions have also made obtaining information more difficult as practitioners are often prohibited from attending conferences out of state.

Most of the states said that they needed more APS staff and resources to improve their own responses to financial exploitation cases, and recognized the need for additional staff for law enforcement and district attorneys as well. They also had some creative suggestions about using other resources such as investigative teams made up of APS staff, law enforcement personnel and district attorneys with expertise in investigating and prosecuting financial exploitation cases. Many states called for more vigorous prosecution of perpetrators, access to national information and better interstate cooperation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY

The number of reports of financial exploitation of elderly and vulnerable adults should be a cause for national concern. When elderly people are deprived of their homes and life savings, they never recover financially. These financial losses also lead to depression and increased physical problems. In addition, after a lifetime of being self-sufficient, many of these victims become dependent on public benefits. Research is needed on the amount of financial loss to victims, as well as the fiscal impact on public benefit programs when these victims are no longer financially self-sufficient.

The number of financial exploitation reports being made to APS and anecdotal information about the increasing complexity of these cases result in the need for a more coordinated and educated response. While many states would like more APS staff and better training, their comments indicated that they were anxious to collaborate with law enforcement, district attorneys and judges to provide the best possible protection to victims of financial exploitation. National, state and local projects to address financial

⁷ Baumhover, Loren A., and Beall, S. Colleen, "Characteristics of Victims and Perpetrators", *Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of Older Persons*, Health Professions Press, Baltimore, 1996, pp.38-45., and Wilber, Kathleen H., Ph.D., "Material Abuse of the Elderly: When is Guardianship a Solution?" in *Protecting Judgement- Impaired Adults*, DeJowski, Edmund F., JD. Ph.D., Editor, The Haworth Press, New York, 1990 pp. 89-104.

exploitation should encourage and support interdisciplinary efforts which involve a multitude of professionals.

It is apparent that both men and particularly women in the 66 to 80 age group should be targeted for educational programs on how to prevent financial exploitation particularly that which is done by family members. Faith-based organizations and community groups that are frequented by older people might be very effective sponsors of such educational efforts, which could be funded by federal grants.

As in other areas of the Baseline Study, the lack of reliable data creates very real obstacles to program credibility. States need federal funds to develop data management systems that can produce regular and credible information. In addition, there is a critical need to develop mechanisms for sharing perpetrator information between systems as well as across state lines.

This study also points out that special efforts need to be made to involve all professional financial service providers in the process of identifying and reducing financial exploitation. Their lack of engagement in cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults, both in their role as reporters and as participants on community and state coalitions and teams remains a critical concern among states. In addition to involving them directly on collaborative state and community groups, financial institutions should be included in state reporting laws. Their staff should receive training on an ongoing basis about their role in identifying and reporting financial exploitation. And public awareness campaigns should emphasize the need for their involvement in this issue.

The need for more training for APS staff is a theme that appears all through this Baseline Study. Since it is possible that many exploitation cases may involve crimes against older people and people with disabilities, it is reasonable to expect APS to be referring more of these cases to the criminal justice system. This report highlights the need for staff and cross training with the criminal justice system, and calls for better interagency collaboration. Policy makers need to provide more funding to support cross training grant opportunities, as well as funds for pilot programs to develop expertise in the investigation and prosecution of financial exploitation cases. In addition, specialized staff devoted to development and support for such activities are necessary. Multi-disciplinary teams should be strongly encouraged and supported at both local and state levels.

Finally, recognition and credit should go to the many creative professionals who have learned how to collaborate on cases of financial exploitation. They support and substantially improve the level and quality of services to vulnerable adults who are the victims of financial exploitation. These professionals carry on despite the ongoing lack of resources and public indifference. Their efforts should be documented as best practices which other communities could replicate. They should be recognized by their communities, and their cooperative efforts given media attention.



Table Of Contents

QUESTION	PAGE #
Please indicate whether data provided for this survey is from the most recent calendar or fiscal year available. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 1	<u>1</u>
A. 1. Does your state have a mandatory reporting statute that includes financial exploitation along with other forms of abuse, neglect and exploitation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 2	<u>2</u>
A. 2. Does your state have a separate mandatory reporting statute that refers only to the reporting of financial exploitation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 3	<u>2-3</u>
A. 2. a. If yes, please list the mandated reporters as they are specified in the statute?	<u>3</u>
A. 3. In your state, financial institutions are held to which of the following standards regarding the reporting of financial exploitation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 4	<u>3-4</u>
A. 4. How many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults came to APS from each of the following? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Pages 4-5	<u>4-6</u>
A. 4. a. How many of the above report cases were substantiated by APS? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Pages 6-7	<u>6-7</u>
A. 4. b. Approximately how many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults were made by APS to law enforcement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 8	<u>7-8</u>
A. 4. c. Approximately how many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults were made by APS to prosecutors/district attorneys? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 9	<u>8-9</u>
A. 5. Does your state have a perpetrator registry for those who financially exploit vulnerable adults? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 10	<u>9-10</u>
A. 5. a. If yes, which of the following perpetrator information is recorded on the perpetrator registry? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 11	<u>10-11</u>
B. 6. Approximately, what was the statewide total value of assets involved in all substantiated cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults during the past year? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 12	<u>11-12</u>
B. 7. From your experience, which of the following is most likely to apply in substantiated cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 13	<u>13</u>
B. 8. What was the total number of financial exploitation cases reported to APS during the last reporting year? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 14-15	<u>14-15</u>
B. 9. Please indicate the percentage of APS clients who are victims of financial exploitation who fall into the following gender categories? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 15-16	<u>15-16</u>

Table Of Contents

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>PAGE #</u>
B. 10. Please indicate the percentage of APS clients who are victims of financial exploitation who fall into the following age categories? _____	16
C. 11. Which of the following have been developed in your state specifically to address the issues of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 17	16-17
C. 12. At the state level, are banks and other financial institutions represented on APS coalitions? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 18	18
C. 13. At the local level, are banks and other financial institutions represented on APS Multi-Disciplinary Teams? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 19	18-19
D. 14. Is the training on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults available to APS workers? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 20	19-20
D. 14. a. If yes, who provides such training? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 21	20-21
D. 14. b. How is such training funded? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 22-23	21-23
E. 15. Provide an overall rating to each of the following agencies in regards to their level of response to APS financial exploitation cases. _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Pages 25	23-25
E. 16. Which of the following would improve the APS response to financial exploitation cases? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Pages 26 and 28	26-28
E. 17. Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs and judges in responding to financial exploitation cases? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 29	28-29
E. 18. Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs and district attorney's offices in responding to financial exploitation cases? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 30	29-30
E. 19. Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs judges in responding to financial exploitation cases? _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table: Page 31	30-31

Appendicies

1. State Responses to Financial Exploitation – Blank Survey
2. Participating and Non-participating States
3. State Survey Contacts



State Responses to Financial Exploitation Survey - 2001 Final Report

Please indicate whether data provided for this survey is from the most recent calendar or fiscal year available.

N = Total Number of Responses:	31	88.6%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Georgia, New Mexico, North Dakota, West Virginia.

Calendar Year:	8	25.8%
-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Fiscal Year:	23	74.2%
---------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington.

NOTES α

- φ CT “SFY 7/1/2000 - 6/30/2001.”
- φ LA2 “2000 - 2001.”
- φ OH “2001.”
- φ SD “July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001.”
- φ TX “2001 - 9/1/00 - 8/31/01.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Calendar Year:	8	25.8 %
Fiscal Year:	23	76.7 %
Total (N=)	31	88.6 %

SECTION A. Reports/Cases of Financial Exploitation

A. 1. Does your state have a mandatory reporting statute that includes financial exploitation along with other forms of abuse, neglect and exploitation?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Yes:	29	82.9%
-------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ CT “In CT, exploitation means financial and property exploitation.”
φ IL “For older persons who are unable to self report.”

No:	6	17.1%
------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Delaware, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ DE “Not for APS clients that reside in independent community settings.”
φ WV “Except that "unlawful expenditure of funds" is included as part of definition of neglect.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	29	82.9%
No:	6	17.1%
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

A. 2. Does your state have a separate mandatory reporting statute that refers only to the reporting of financial exploitation?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Yes:	0	0.0%
-------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

No:	35	100.0%
------------	-----------	---------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio,

Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	0	0.0 %
No:	35	100.0 %
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

A. 2.a. *If yes, please list the mandated reporters as they are specified in the statute.*

N = Total Number of Responses:	0	0.0%
---------------------------------------	----------	-------------

NOT REPORTING α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

A. 3. *In your state, financial institutions are held to which of the following standards regarding the reporting of financial exploitation:*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

State Legislative Mandate:	11	31.4%
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Florida, Georgia, Kansas*, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

NOTES α
 φ KS* “Kansas financial institutions are subject both to State Legislative Mandate and are Encouraged to Report Voluntarily – See following note.”
 φ KS “Statute mandates only Bank Trust Officer.”
 φ SC “They are not specifically named but are included in "any other person who has actual knowledge”.”
 φ WY “Current legislation list “any person” must report.”

Encouraged to Report Voluntarily:	17	48.6%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas*, Louisiana 1, Maine, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin.

NOTES α
 φ KS* “Kansas financial institutions are subject both to State Legislative Mandate and are Encouraged to Report Voluntarily – See note above.”

Not Applicable:	8	22.9%
------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana 2, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, West Virginia.

NOTES α
 φ AR “Financial institutions are not mandated reporter.”

φ LA2 “Law applies to individuals - not institutions.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
State Legislative Mandate:	11	31.4 %
Encouraged to Report Voluntarily:	17	48.6 %
Not Applicable:	8	22.9 %
Total (N=)	35*	100.0 %

NOTES α φKS* Kansas financial institutions are subject both to State Legislative Mandate and are Encouraged to Report Voluntarily – See Kansas notes above. As a result, the percentage for individual responses adds up to more than 100%.

A. 4. How many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults came to APS from each of the following:

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Data Not Available:	20	57.1%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ FL “May be able to run Dargal Report, but data not available at this time.”
 φ KS “Kansas has 2 statutes for exploitation: Exploitation and Fiduciary Abuse.”
 φ WY “Not on current data report. Could possibly get out of system but not in time for this survey.”

Number of States Reporting Data	15	42.9%
Banks:	54	0.3%
Prosecutors/District Attorneys:	87	0.5%
Law Enforcement:	614	3.3%
Other (Includes: Source Not Available):	17,721	95.9%
N = Total Number of Reports:	18,476	

STATES α Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Guam*, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas.

SUMMARY TABLE α

The following table provides state-by-state data of reports of financial exploitation reported to state APS. Percentage figures following specific sources (columns) represent the source percentages compared to all data for the specific state listed in the specific rows found in column one. The percentage figures shown in the last column represent each specific state’s Total Number of Reports as a percentage of the overall Total Number of Reports (18,818) as provided by all reporting states. The percentage totals located in the last row at the bottom of the table represent the specific category (Banks, Prosecutors and DA’s, Law Enforcement, and Other) as a percentage of the overall Total Number of Reports (18,818) as provided by all reporting states.

STATE	BANKS	%	PROSECUTORS And DA's	%	LAW ENFORCE- MENT	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%
Arizona	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1902	100.0%	1902	10.29%
Arkansas	5	2.1%	6	2.5%	74	31.1%	153	64.3%	238	1.29%
California	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	531	100.0%	531	2.87%
Delaware	9	52.9%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	0	0.0%	17	0.09%
Guam*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.00%
Illinois	25	0.7%	29	0.8%	218	5.7%	3546	92.9%	3818	20.66%
Iowa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	214	100.0%	214	1.16%
Louisiana 1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	488	100.0%	488	2.64%
Louisiana 2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	100.0%	0	0.0%	17	0.09%
Nebraska	4	1.5%	7	2.6%	21	7.8%	238	88.1%	270	1.46%
Oregon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	151	100.0%	151	0.82%
Pennsylvania	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1972	100.0%	1972	10.67%
South Dakota	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.01%
Tennessee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	75	10.9%	610	89.1%	685	3.71%
Texas	11	0.1%	42	0.5%	202	2.5%	7916	96.9%	8171	44.22%
TOTAL	54	0.29%	87	0.47%	614	3.32%	17721	95.91%	18476	100.00%

NOTES α

The following notes refer to state information regarding the “OTHER” category

- φ AZ Other: “Family Members – includes other allegations - 12.1% = 230 reports.
Other: “Social Services - includes other allegations - 39.9% = 759 reports.
“Please refer to demographics sheet enclosed.”
- φ AR Other: Health Care Professionals = 74 reports.
Other: DHS Employees = 17 reports.
Other: Social Security = 3 reports.
Other: Family or Neighbors = 85 reports
Other: Miscellaneous = 48 reports.
- φ CA Other: “531 cases reported in 58 counties for SFY 1999-2001
- φ GU* Other: “Family Members.” - Actual data was not provided.
- φ IL Other: “See list attached.” – A list naming “REPORTER TYPE” was provided.
However, specific data related to “REPORTER TYPE” was not provided.
- φ IA Other: “All sources.”
- φ LA1 Other: “Data not available by category.”
- φ NE Other: Relatives, Friends, Neighbors, Guardian, POA, Payee = 79 reports.
Other: Medical staff, Facility staff, Social Services providers = 104 reports.
Other: Data source not available = 55 reports.
- φ OR Other: County Case Management Staff = 119 reports.
Other: Provider Staff = 32 reports.
- φ PA Other: “All PA data is aggregate. We know that in SFY 99-2000 1972 cases of exploitation were received by AAA's but cannot tell how many reports were made by banks or any other report source.”
- φ TN Banks: Not Available
Prosecutors / District Attorneys: Not Available
Other: Relatives = 233 reports.
Other: All other data referral sources = 377 reports.
- φ TX Other: Adult Children = 1,143 reports.
Other: Insurance Staff = 1,057 reports.
Other: Friends and Neighbors = 830 reports.
Other: Grandchildren = 219 reports.
Other: Other Relatives = 540 reports.
Other: Other = 3,133 reports.
Other: Parent = 99 reports.
Other: Service Provider = 567 reports.

Other: Sibling = 252 reports.
 φ TX Other: Spouse = 52 reports.
 Other: No Relationship = 24 reports.

A. 4. a. How many of the above report cases were substantiated by APS?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Data Not Available:	23	65.7%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ UT “74 Total cases were submitted.”

Number of States Reporting Data	12	34.3%
Banks:	24	0.5%
Prosecutors/District Attorneys:	23	0.5%
Law Enforcement:	209	4.5%
Other (Includes: Source Not Available):	4,370	94.5%
N = Total Number of Reports:	4,626	

STATES α Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Guam*, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas.

SUMMARY TABLE α

The following table provides state-by-state data of substantiated reports of financial exploitation reported to state APS. Percentage figures following specific sources (columns) represent the source percentages compared to all data for the specific state listed in the specific rows found in column one. The percentage figures shown in the last column represent each specific state’s Total Number of Substantiated Reports as a percentage of the overall Total Number Substantiated of Reports (4626) as provided by all reporting states. The percentage totals located in the last row at the bottom of the table represent the specific category (Banks, Prosecutors and DA’s, Law Enforcement, and Other) as a percentage of the overall Total Number Substantiated of Reports (4626) as provided by all reporting states.

STATE	BANKS	%	PROSE CUTORS And DA’s	%	LAW ENFORCE -MENT	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%
Arkansas	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	10	0.22%
California	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	425	100.0%	425	9.19%
Delaware	7	53.8%	1	7.7%	5	41.2%	0	0.0%	13	0.28%
Guam	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	0.09%
Illinois	14	0.7%	16	0.8%	145	7.5%	1753	91.0%	1928	41.68%
Louisiana 2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	0.15%
Nebraska	0	0.0%	4	2.4%	15	9.0%	148	88.6%	167	3.61%
Oregon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	47	100.0%	47	1.02%
Pennsylvania	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	420	100.0%	420	9.08%
South Dakota	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.00%

STATE	BANKS	%	PROSECUTORS And DA's	%	LAW ENFORCEMENT	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%
Tennessee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	363	100.0%	363	7.85%
Texas	3	0.1%	2	0.5%	36	2.5%	1201	96.9%	1242	26.85%
TOTAL	24	0.52%	23	0.50%	209	4.52%	4370	94.46%	4626	100.00%

NOTES α

The following notes refer to state information regarding the “OTHER” category.

- φ AR Other: Health Care Professionals = 5 reports.
Other: Family Member = 3 reports
Other: Miscellaneous = 1 report.
- φ CA Other: “APS Confirmed 425 cases of financial abuse in SFY 99/2000.”
- φ GU Other: Family Member = 4 reports.
- φ IL Other: “See list attached.” – A list naming “REPORTER TYPE” was provided. However, specific data related to “REPORTER TYPE” was not provided.
- φ NE Other: Relatives, Friends, Neighbors, Guardian, PDA, Payee = 52 reports.
Other: Medical staff, Facility staff, Social Services Providers = 78 reports.
Other: Data source not available = 18 reports.
- φ OR Other: County Case Management Staff = 38 reports.
Other: Provider Staff - Residential = 9 reports.
- φ PA Other: “Total number of unduplicated, substantiated cases involving exploitation was 420 (Number by source of report is not available).”
- φ TN Other: Not broken down by referral source.
- φ TX Other: Adult Children = 182 reports.
Other: Insurance Staff = 187 reports.
Other: Friends and Neighbors = 91 reports.
Other: Grandchildren = 30 reports.
Other: Other Relatives = 75 reports.
Other: Other = 473 reports.
Other: Parent = 12 reports.
Other: Service Provider = 111 reports.
Other: Sibling = 31 reports.
Other: Spouse = 7 reports.
Other: No Relationship = 2 reports.

A. 4. b. *Approximately how many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults were made by APS to law enforcement?*

Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
-----------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Data Not Available:	19	54.3%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ WV “Included with all neglect reports - if solely F.E. referred to law enforcement screened out as APS.”

Total Reports To Law Enforcement:	2,846
Number of States Reporting Data;	16
Average Per Reporting State:	178
Range:	2 -787

STATES α Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Louisiana 2, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington.

SUMMARY TABLE α

STATE	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
Arizona	208	7.31%	6
Arkansas	5	0.18%	13
Delaware	35	1.23%	9
Florida	787	27.65%	1
Guam	2	0.07%	16
Illinois	50	1.76%	8
Louisiana 2	20	0.70%	11
Nebraska	270	9.49%	4
Nevada	55	1.93%	7
North Dakota	10	0.35%	12
Oregon	27	0.95%	10
South Carolina	247	8.68%	5
South Dakota	4	0.14%	15
Tennessee	685	24.07%	2
Texas	5	0.18%	13
Washington	436	15.32%	3
TOTAL	2846	100.00%	

NOTES α φ WV “From Jan - 01 to Sept. - 01”
φ SC “Clients reported.”

A. 4. c. *Approximately how many reports of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults were made by APS to prosecutors/district attorneys?*

Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
-----------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Data Not Available:	23	65.7%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Total Reports To Prosecutors/District Attorneys:	1,152
Number of States Reporting Data;	12
Average Per Reporting State:	96
Range:	0 -787

STATES α Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Louisiana 2, Maine, Nebraska, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Wyoming.

SUMMARY TABLE α

STATE	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
Arkansas	5	0.43%	7
Delaware	28	2.43%	4
Florida	787	68.31%	1
Guam	2	0.17%	11
Illinois	4	0.35%	9
Louisiana 2	4	0.35%	9
Maine	20	1.74%	5
Nebraska	44	3.82%	3
Oregon	6	0.52%	6
South Carolina	247	21.44%	2
Tennessee	0	0.00%	12
Wyoming	5	0.43%	7
TOTAL	1152	100.00%	

NOTES α φ TN “APS in TN does not report to DA's or prosecutors.”
 φ WV “From Jan - 01 to Sept. - 01”
 φ WY “25 cases investigated, 5 substantiated – all substantiated cases are reported to prosecutors.”

A. 5. *Does your state have a perpetrator registry for those who financially exploit vulnerable adults?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Yes:	10	28.6%
-------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ FL “Chapter 415, Florida Statutes, prohibits the classification of reports and naming an individual as a perpetrator. Further, the Abuse Hotline Information System can not be used to screen for employment purposes.”

No:	25	71.4%
------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ AZ “Only info on client automated file.”
 φ IA “The registry is for all altercations.”
 φ LA2 “No statutory registry - We maintain provided information internally.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	10	28.6 %
No:	25	71.4 %
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

A. 5. a. *If yes, which of the following perpetrator information is recorded on the perpetrator registry?*

Total Number of Responses:	10	100.0%
-----------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Louisiana 1, Maine, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Case Number:	7	70.0%
---------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Hawaii, Louisiana 2, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

Perpetrator Name:	10	100.0%
--------------------------	-----------	---------------

STATES α Arkansas, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

Alias Names:	2	20.0%
---------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Missouri, Wyoming.

Date of Birth:	8	80.0%
-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

Social Security Number:	7	70.0%
--------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Wyoming.

Current Address:	6	60.0%
-------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Hawaii, Louisiana 2, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

Previous Addresses:	1	10.0%
----------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Wyoming.

Relationship to Victim:	7	70.0%
--------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana 2, Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming.

Type of Exploitation Activities:	4	40.0%
---	----------	--------------

STATES α Iowa, Louisiana 2, Utah, Wyoming.

History of Crimes Against Vulnerable Adults:	3	30.0%
---	----------	--------------

STATES α Missouri, Utah, Wyoming.

Other:	2	20.0%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Iowa, Kansas.

NOTES α φ IA “Other data is acquired, if possible.”
φ KS “Sex, Date of confirmation, type (abuse, neglect, etc.)”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
Case Number:	7	70.0%	3
Perpetrator Name:	10	100.0%	1
Alias Names:	2	20.0%	9
Date of Birth:	8	80.0%	2
Social Security Number:	7	70.0%	3
Current Address:	6	60.0%	6
Previous Addresses:	1	10.0%	11
Relationship to Victim:	7	70.0%	3
Type of Exploitation Activities:	4	40.0%	7
History of Crimes Against Vulnerable Adults:	3	30.0%	8
Other:	2	20.0%	9

SECTION B. Financial / Client Information

B. 6. *Approximately, what was the statewide total value of assets involved in all substantiated cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults during the past year?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Data Not Available:	34	97.1%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ IL “Started to collect on 7/01/01.”

\$ 5,000 - \$10,000:	0	0.0%
-----------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$10,001 - \$50,000:	0	0.0%
-----------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$50,001 - \$100,000:	1	2.9%
------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α Oregon.

\$100,001 - \$500,000:	0	0.0%
-------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$500,001 - 1,000,000:	0	0.0%
-------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$1,000,001 - \$2,000,000:	0	0.0%
-----------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$2,000,001 - \$5,000,000:	0	0.0%
-----------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000:	0	0.0%
------------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

\$10,000,001 and Above:	0	0.0%
--------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
Data Not Available:	34	97.1%
\$ 5,000 - \$10,000:	0	0.0%
\$10,001 - \$50,000:	0	0.0%
\$50,001 - \$100,000:	1	2.9%
\$100,001 - \$500,000:	0	0.0%
\$500,001 - 1,000,000:	0	0.0%
\$1,000,001 - \$2,000,000:	0	0.0%
\$2,000,001 - \$5,000,000:	0	0.0%
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000:	0	0.0%
\$10,000,001 and Above:	0	0.0%

B. 7. From your experience, which of the following is most likely to apply in substantiated cases of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults?

N = Total Number of Responses:	34	97.1%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Louisiana 2.

Financially exploited APS clients have <u>higher</u> incomes than other APS clients:	7	20.6%
---	----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Nebraska, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee.

Financially exploited APS clients have income <u>similar</u> to other APS clients:	11	32.4%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Washington.

NOTES α φ OR “Due to disability most are low income.”

Financially exploited APS clients have <u>lower</u> incomes than other APS clients:	0	0.0%
--	----------	-------------

STATES α None.

Other:	4	11.8%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Delaware, Louisiana 1, Maine, South Dakota.

NOTES α φ DE “It’s a mixture. The income and material/property value of these cases vary greatly in our state. Low income clients and high income clients have been sub. Cases of F/E.”
 φ LA1 “Amount of income does not have a significant role. Access is main role.”
 φ ME “Income may be similar but assets are higher.”
 φ SD “APS clients are exploited in order to obtain property/resources rather than income.”

Data Not Available:	14	41.2%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, California, Connecticut, Guam, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ CT “Financial exploitation goes hand in hand with other forms of abuse and or neglect (i.e. multiple issues).”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
Higher:	7	20.6%
Similar:	11	32.4%
Lower:	0	0.0%
Other:	4	11.8%
Data Not Available:	14	41.2%

B. 8. What was the total number of financial exploitation cases reported to APS during the last reporting year?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Data Not Available:	6	17.1%
----------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Georgia, Maine, Mississippi, North Dakota, West Virginia.

Total Number of Cases:	38,015
Number of States Reporting Data;	28*
Average Per Reporting State:	1358
Range:	59 - 8171

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α

- φ AZ “Total # reported - including abuse and neglect. = 10243.”
- φ CA “Cases reported in SFY 99/2000.”
- φ KS “Exploitation = 768, Fiduciary Abuse = 196, Total = 964.”
- φ LA* NAAPSA NOTE: For this question, the information from LA1 and LA2 have been combined. As a result, the Number of States Reporting Data and the number of states answering Data Not Available totals 34. However, all 35 surveys answered the question.
- φ PA “420 Substantiated.”
- φ SC “May not include all (this is number of clients).”

SUMMARY TABLE α

STATE	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
Alabama	855	2.25%	12
Arizona	1902	5.00%	7
Arkansas	238	0.63%	22
California	531	1.40%	17
Delaware	148	0.39%	25
Florida	7204	18.95%	2
Guam	71	0.19%	26
Hawaii	63	0.17%	27
Illinois	3726	9.80%	3
Iowa	214	0.56%	23
Kansas	964	2.54%	10
Louisiana 1	488*	1.28%	18
Louisiana 2	364*	0.96%	19
Missouri	2388	6.28%	5
Nebraska	270	0.71%	20
Nevada	671	1.77%	14
New Mexico	860	2.26%	11
North Carolina	1004	2.64%	9
Ohio	1030	2.71%	8

Oregon	151	0.40%	24
STATE	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
Pennsylvania	1972	5.19%	6
South Carolina	247	0.65%	21
South Dakota	59	0.16%	28
Tennessee	685	1.80%	13
Texas	8171	21.49%	1
Utah	603	1.59%	15
Washington	2528	6.65%	4
Wisconsin	583	1.53%	16
Wyoming	25	0.07%	29
TOTAL	38015	100.00%	

NOTES α φ LA1 and LA2* NAAPSA NOTE: The combined total number of cases for both programs reporting from Louisiana is 852 or 2.24%. This total would give Louisiana a overall ranking of 13.

B. 9. Please indicate the percentage of APS clients who are victims of financial exploitation who fall into the following gender categories?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Data Not Available:	20	57.1%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ MO “Mostly female.”
φ ND “Verbal reports indicate mostly women.”

Number of States Reporting Data:	15	42.9%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana 2, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Percent Male:	41.6%
Percent Female:	58.4%

SUMMARY TABLE α

STATE	% MALE	% FEMALE
Arkansas	37.0%	63.0%
Florida	37.0%	63.0%
Guam	46.0%	54.0%
Hawaii	52.0%	48.0%
Illinois	32.0%	68.0%
Louisiana 2	54.0%	46.0%
Nebraska	42.0%	58.0%
Nevada	41.0%	59.0%
North Carolina	40.0%	60.0%

South Dakota	24.0%	76.0%
STATE	% MALE	% FEMALE
Tennessee	38.0%	62.0%
Texas	35.0%	65.0%
Utah	40.0%	60.0%
Washington	46.0%	54.0%
Wyoming	60.0%	40.0%

B. 10. *Please indicate the percentage of APS clients who are victims of financial exploitation who fall into the following age categories?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Data Not Available:	23	67.6%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Percent 18 – 30 Years Old:	5.5%
-----------------------------------	-------------

Percent 31 – 50 Years Old:	17.5%
-----------------------------------	--------------

Percent 51 – 65 Years Old:	12.9%
-----------------------------------	--------------

Percent 66 – 80 Years Old:	40.1%
-----------------------------------	--------------

Percent 80+ Years Old:	24.1%
-------------------------------	--------------

SECTION C. Multi-Disciplinary Teams

C. 11. *Which of the following have been developed in your state specifically to address the issues of financial exploitation of vulnerable adults?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	24	68.6%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Arkansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia.

State Multi-Disciplinary Teams:	3	12.5%
--	----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa.

NOTES α φ AZ “Task forces = address elder crime.”
φ ND “Verbal reports indicate mostly women.”

Local Multi-Disciplinary Teams:	14	58.3%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Wisconsin.

NOTES α
 φ AZ “Task forces = address elder crime.”
 φ GA “A few around the state.”
 φ KS “In some areas only. Not statewide.”
 φ GA “Required as of CY 2002.”

Fiduciary Abuse and Specialist Team (F.A.S.T):	5	20.8%
---	----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, California, Kansas, Ohio, Wisconsin.

NOTES α
 φ OH “At the local level.”
 φ WI “Operating in a few counties of the state.”

Other:	15	62.5%
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α California (2), Connecticut, Delaware, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois (2), Maine, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α
 φ CA “Local elder abuse councils.”
 φ CA “CA. Community Partnership for the Prevention of Financial Abuse (CCPPFA)s.”
 φ CT “Bank reporting advisory committee (state wide).”
 φ DE “Combination thru State Police, Ag's fraud unit and state APS.”
 φ GU “Training for banks in helping prevent financial exploitation.”
 φ HI “Received grant from Byrne Formula Grant. Project to hire (3) staff - social worker; Auditor; SW Assistant.”
 φ IL “Governor appointed Elder Abuse Task Force.”
 φ IL “B&SAFE - Bankers and Seniors Against Financial Exploitation (Bank Reporting).”
 φ ME “Training banks and credit unions.”
 φ OR “Volunteer accountants/bankers who assist APS.”
 φ SD “Interagency meetings between Adult Services (Social Services) and State Medicaid Fraud Control Unit (Attorney General).”
 φ TN “Case consultation teams for all types of APS cases.”
 φ TX “Financial abuse cessation team (state level group).”
 φ WI “In CY 02 - Intention is to have state level FAST.”
 φ WY “Working on change in statute which will give immunity for reporting – banks are specifically listed in immunity statute.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
State Multi-Disciplinary Teams:	3	12.5%
Local Multi-Disciplinary Teams:	14	58.3%
Fiduciary Abuse and Specialist Team (F.A.S.T):	5	20.8%
Other:	15	62.5%

C. 12. *At the state level, are banks and other financial institutions represented on APS coalitions?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Yes:	5	14.3%
-------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Illinois, Louisiana 1, Texas, Wisconsin.

NOTES α
 φ IL “On State TRIAD.”
 φ WI “As of CY 02, it is our intention to involve these players.”

No:	24	68.6%
------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ KS “No state legal condition - "local" only.”

Data Not Available:	6	17.1%
----------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Florida, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, West Virginia.

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	5	14.3%
No:	24	68.6%
Data Not Available:	6	17.1%
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

C. 13. *At the local level, are banks and other financial institutions represented on APS Multi-Disciplinary Teams?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Always:	1	2.9%
----------------	----------	-------------

STATES α Illinois.

Usually:	2	5.7%
-----------------	----------	-------------

STATES α Utah, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ WI “As of CY 02, it is our intention to involve these players.”

Sometimes:	7	20.0%
-------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Pennsylvania.

Rarely:	9	25.7%
----------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Guam, Louisiana 2, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Washington.

NOTES α φ WA “Regional resource teams.”

Never:	5	14.3%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α California, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon.

NOTES α φ CA “Due to confidentiality.”

Data Not Available:	11	31.4%
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming

NOTES α φ DE “We don't have a formal multi-disciplinary team.”
φ WY “Don't think so but will work on including.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Always:	1	2.9%
Usually:	2	5.7%
Sometimes:	7	20.0%
Rarely:	9	25.7%
Never:	5	14.3%
Data Not Available:	11	31.4%
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

SECTION D. Training

D. 14. Is the training on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults available to APS workers?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Yes:	30	85.7%
-------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α ϕ MS “Training includes all categories of abuse. No staff specialized for APS program. Financial exploitation training included as a small segment of the overall intensive training for new social workers.”
 ϕ WA “Occasionally.”
 ϕ WV “But only as it relates to investigation of neglect resulting from "financial exploitation.””

No:	4	11.4%
------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee.

NOTES α ϕ CT “Only if they attend a conference where this topic is covered. CT provides no specific training.”

Data Not Available:	1	2.9%
----------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α Kansas.

SUMMARY TABLE α

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	30	85.7%
No:	4	11.4%
Data Not Available:	1	2.9%
Total (N=)	35	100.0 %

D. 14. a. *If yes, who provides such training?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	30	85.7%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Connecticut, Kansas, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee.

State APS Staff:	21	70.0%
-------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wyoming.

County APS Staff:	4	13.3%
--------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α California, Georgia, Oregon, West Virginia.

University Staff:	1	3.3%
--------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α Arizona.

Law Enforcement Staff:	8	26.7%
-------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Arkansas, Iowa, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin.

Prosecutor/District Attorney Staff:	8	26.7%
--	----------	--------------

STATES α California, Delaware, Florida, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ OR “Annual conference.”

F.A.S.T. Team Members:	2	6.7%
-------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α California, Wisconsin.

Coalition/Consortium Staff:	1	3.3%
------------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES α California.

Other:	12	40.0%
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana 2, Maine, Missouri, Nevada, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α

- φ AR “NAAPSA and other conferences.”
- φ HI “Out-of-state consultant.”
- φ IL “Local provider Agency Staff and contract with State.”
“Special Teachings - e.g. Chayo Reyes.”
- φ IA “Department of Elder Affairs Legal Services.”
- φ LA2 “Outside consultants (rarely).”
- φ ME “Department of the Attorney General Investigator.”
- φ MO “Annual training conference - various presenters including prosecutors and law enforcement.”
- φ NV “Outside trainees brought in to provide seminars.”
- φ PA “Annual enrichment conference presentation by various presenters.”
- φ SD “Medical Fraud Control Unit.”
- φ WI “Coalition of Wisconsin Aging Group's Elder Law Center.”
- φ WY “We work closely with Medical Fraud.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
State APS Staff:	21	72.0%
County APS Staff:	4	13.3%
University Staff:	1	3.3%
Law Enforcement Staff:	8	26.7%
Prosecutor/District Attorney Staff:	8	26.7%
F.A.S.T. Team Members:	2	6.7%
Coalition/Consortium Staff:	1	3.3%
Other:	12	40.0%
Total (N=)	30	100.0%

D. 14. b. How is such training funded?

N = Total Number of Responses:	35	100.0%
---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None

Data Not Available:**8****22.9%**STATES α

Connecticut, Georgia, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee.

States Reporting Data:**27****77.1%**STATES α

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

SUMMARY TABLE α

The following table provides data relevant to state-by-state training fund allocation resources. Many states were unable to provide specific funding percentages for individual resources. Resource allocations where specific percentages were unavailable are marked with an (X). The total number of respondents providing either specific or non-specific resource allocations was 29. As a result, N=29 was used for percentages found at the bottom of the table. States receiving allocations from multiple sources results in the total percentage of source allocations being greater than 100%.

STATE	SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT	COUNTY ALLOCATION	STATE ALLOCATION	OTHER	DATA NOT AVAILABLE
Alabama	100%				
Arizona			X	X	
Arkansas	X		X		
California		X	X	X	
Connecticut					X
Delaware			100%		
Florida	X		X		
Georgia					X
Guam			X		
Hawaii			100%		
Illinois			100%		
Iowa			100%		
Kansas					X
Louisiana 1			100%		
Louisiana 2			100%		
Maine				100%	
Mississippi	X		X		
Missouri					X
Nebraska			100%		
Nevada	100%				
New Mexico					X
North Carolina					X
North Dakota					X
Ohio	2.0%				
Oregon		25.0%	75.0%		
Pennsylvania				X	
South Carolina	X				
South Dakota	X		X	X	
Tennessee					X
Texas	84.02%		6.48%	9.5%	

STATE	SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT	COUNTY ALLOCATION	STATE ALLOCATION	OTHER	DATA NOT AVAILABLE
Utah			100%		
Washington				X	
West Virginia				X	
Wisconsin				100%	
Wyoming			X		
TOTAL	9	2	18	9	8
PERCENT	33.3%	7.4%	66.7%	33.3%	22.9%

- NOTES α
- φ AZ “35,000.”
” Pays for out service also.”
 - φ CA “Specific percentages are not available.”
Other – “Local community organizations.”
 - φ FL “Social Services Block Grant funding supports our district APS Trainer positions. No separate funding is available for training development or delivery.”
 - φ PA “SUA uses its training budget to set up and present the training conferences. AAA staff pay a minimal (usually \$50.00 or so) and travel expense out of local Ageing block grants.”
 - φ SD “Funding not an issue; deemed part of agency's job.”
 - φ TX “Title XIX (Medicaid).”
 - φ WA “Volunteer.”
 - φ WV “We do not have an APS training budget. Virtually all adult services expenditures are paid from general revenue (state) funds. Training is included under current expenses. State office has a budget and each of 4 regions have their own budget. How much \$ APS gets regionally varies and is decided by regional directors.”

SECTION E. Measuring and Improving Responses to Financial Exploitation

E. 15. *Provide an overall rating to each of the following agencies in regards to their level of response to APS financial exploitation cases. (Please circle one rating per agency using the following scale:*

- 1 = NO RESPONSE
- 2 = MINIMAL RESPONSE
- 3 = AVERAGE RESPONSE
- 4 = ABOVE AVERAGE RESPONSE
- 5 = OUTSTANDING RESPONSE

N = Total Number of Responses:	32	91.4%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Nebraska, Pennsylvania, West Virginia.

Law Enforcement (Police/Sheriff):	32	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.7
--	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ CT “Varies greatly by community.”

District Attorneys' Office:	30	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.2
------------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α
 φ CT “Depending on \$ amount and an identified perpetrator.”
 φ WA “Includes County/Parish Attorneys.”

County / Parish Attorneys:	23	AVERAGE SCORE = 1.9
-----------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Judges:	31	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.2
----------------	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

State Attorney Generals' Office:	30	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.9
---	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Bank Officials / Staff:	31	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.4
--------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α
 φ CT “Varies by bank.”

Other:	4	AVERAGE SCORE = 3.0
---------------	----------	----------------------------

STATES α Connecticut, Delaware, Texas, Wyoming.

NOTES α
 φ CT “Office of the Chief State's Attorney.”
 φ TX “Social Security Administration.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

The following table provides state-by-state scores for each category. The Average Score for each category was based on the Total score for each category divided by the (N) for that specific category. NR = Non Reporting State. NA = Non Applicable.

STATE	LAW ENFORCEMENT	DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE	COUNTY/PARISH ATTORNEY	JUDGES	STATE ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE	BANK OFFICIALS STAFF	OTHER
Alabama	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Arizona	3	2	2	2	3	3	
Arkansas	3	3	3	3	4	3	
California	4	3	2	2	2	3	
Connecticut	3	2	NA	2	5	3	4
Delaware	3	NA	2	2	5	2	4
Florida	3	3	2	3	4	4	
Georgia	2	2	1	2	2	2.5	
Guam	3	1	NA	4	3	4	
Hawaii	4	2	1	2	4	2	
Illinois	2	2	NA	2	2	3	
Iowa	3	2	2	2	2	2	
Kansas	2	2	2	2	2	3	
Louisiana 1	4	3	3	3	4	3	
Louisiana 2	2	2	1	3	4	3	
Maine	2	2	NA	1	5	2	
Mississippi	2	1	1	1	3	2	
Missouri	2	2	1	1	3	2	
Nebraska	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
Nevada	3	2	1	2	3	2	
New Mexico	3	3	3	3	3	3	
North Carolina	4	1	2	1	4	1	
North Dakota	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Ohio	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Oregon	2	3	NA	3	4	4	
Pennsylvania	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
South Carolina	3	3	NA	4	4	3	
South Dakota	4	2	NA	3	2	3	
Tennessee	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Texas	2	2	2	4	NA	2	1
Utah	3	2	2	2	3	4	
Washington	2	2	NA	3	3	3	
West Virginia	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
Wisconsin	2	2	3	4	4	2	
Wyoming	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
TOTAL	86	65	45	75	96	82.5	12
N=	32	30	23	31	30	31	4
AVERAGE	2.7	2.2	1.9	2.2	2.9	2.4	3.0

E. 16. Which of the following would improve the APS response to financial exploitation cases?

N = Total Number of Responses:	33	94.3%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Ohio, West Virginia.

More Staff and other resources for APS Programs.:	28	84.8%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Collaborative support from APS multi-disciplinary teams.:	13	39.4%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ CT “In CT there are a few multi-disciplinary teams, but rather than access specific cases, they are educational and networking in nature.

Cross training with other disciplines on responding to financial exploitation cases.:	29	87.8%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Training for which of the following agencies on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults.:	32	97.0%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
More staff and other resources for APS programs:	28	84.8%
Collaborative support from APS multi-disciplinary teams:	13	39.4%
Cross training with other disciplines on responding to financial exploitation cases:	29	87.8%
Training for which of the following agencies on financial exploitation of vulnerable adults:	32	97.0%
Total (N=)	33	94.3%

N = Total Number of Responses Based on Training:	32	100.0%
---	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING α None.

Banks:	30	93.8%
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ WI “Credit Unions and Savings and Loans.”

Law Enforcement:	29	90.6%
-------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

District Attorneys’ Offices:	26	81.3%
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

County/Parish Attorneys:	13	40.6%
---------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Judges:	25	78.1%
----------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Real Estate Agents/Brokers:	13	40.6%
------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Wisconsin.

Title Company Staff:	11	34.4%
-----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Texas.

Notaries Public:	14	43.8%
-------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas.

Other:	7	21.9%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana 2, Maine, Texas, Wisconsin.

NOTES α φ CT “Estate planners.”
“Stock brokers.”
φ DE “Credit card lenders.”

- “ Social Security Administration.”
- “State court system.”
- φ IL “Elder Law Attorneys.”
- φ LA2 “ Lawyers.”
- φ ME “Agencies on Ageing.”
- “Other social service agencies.”
- “ Legal services for the elderly.”
- φ TX “Medical community.”
- “Cooperation from Social Security Administration -e.g. release of information, designated contacts with APS, blocking perpetrator access to clients funds.”
- φ WV “Cross training on how best to collaborate in these and all APS/exploitation cases.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
Banks:	30	93.8%
Law Enforcement:	29	90.6%
District Attorneys’ Offices:	26	81.3%
County/Parish Attorneys:	13	40.6%
Judges:	25	78.1%
Real Estate Agents / Brokers:	13	40.6%
Title Company Staff:	11	34.4%
Notaries Public:	14	43.8%
Other :	7	21.9%
Total (N=)	32	91.2%

E. 17. Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs and judges in responding to financial exploitation cases?

N = Total Number of Responses:	33	94.3%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Ohio, West Virginia.

More staff and other resources for law enforcement agencies.:	21	63.6%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming.

Collaborative support during the investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams.:	19	57.6%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES α φ CT “CT there are a few M teams, but rather than access specific cases, they are educational and networking in nature.”

Cross training with law enforcement on responding to financial exploitation cases.:	29	87.8%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Other:	8	25.0%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Louisiana 2, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia.

NOTES α

- φ CT “Training for law enforcement in talking with, interviewing, understanding elderly - mental health.”
- φ LA2 “Training for law enforcement on prosecuting/investigating cases whose victims are not good witnesses.”
- φ ND “We are in process of 8 state-wide trainings.”
- φ OR “Willingness to pursue smaller amount loses.”
- φ SD “Special units dedicated to abuse, neglect or exploitation cases.”
- φ TN “More staff for APS, to specialize in financial exploitation.”
- φ TX “Confidentiality across state lines. Posting of known, but un-apprehended perpetrators on a national website and photos and MO's or physical description.”
- φ WV “Cross training on how best to collaborate in these and all APS/exploitation cases.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
More staff and their resources for law enforcement agencies:	21	63.6%
Collaborative support during the investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams:	19	57.6%
Cross training with law enforcement on responding to financial exploitation cases:	29	87.8%
Other:	8	25.0%
Total (N=)	33	94.3%

E. 18. *Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs and district attorney’s offices in responding to financial exploitation cases?*

N = Total Number of Responses:	34	97.1%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Ohio.

More staff and other resources for criminal justice agencies.:	17	50.0%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wyoming.

Collaborative support during the investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams.:	18	52.9%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Missouri, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Cross training with prosecutors / DA's investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams.:	31	91.2%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Other:	9	26.5%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana 2, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia.

NOTES α

- φ CT “Reprioritizing of overall cases values shift to see as important.”
- φ GA “Cross-training with DA's/APS/Banks.”
- φ IL “Education on vulnerable adult abuse, on APS and need to respond aggressively to these cases.”
- φ LA2 “Training for law enforcement on prosecuting/investigating cases whose victims are not good witnesses.”
- φ OR “Willingness to pursue smaller amount loses.”
- φ SD “Special units dedicated to abuse, neglect or exploitation cases.”
- φ TN “More staff for APS, to specialize in financial exploitation and specialized prosecutors..”
- φ TX “Improve SSA rep payee safeguards, Improve P o A accountability.”
- φ WV “Better laws (Victim not a good witness. Paper trail obscured).”
- φ WV “Cross training on how best to collaborate in these and all APS/exploitation cases.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
More staff and other resources for agencies criminal justice agencies:	17	50.0%
Collaborative support during the APS investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams:	18	52.9%
Cross training with prosecutors / DA's investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams:	31	91.2%
Other:	9	26.5%
Total (N=)	34	97.1%

E. 19. Which of the following would improve the working relationship between APS programs and judges in responding to financial exploitation cases?

N = Total Number of Responses:	33	94.3%
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α Ohio, Washington.

More staff and other resources for criminal	12	36.4%
--	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, Wyoming.

Collaborative support during the investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams.:	12	36.4%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Arkansas, Florida, Guam, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 2, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Texas, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Cross training with judges on responding to financial exploitation cases.:	28	84.8%
---	-----------	--------------

STATES α Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana 1, Louisiana 2, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Other:	6	18.8%
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES α Connecticut, Illinois, South Dakota, Texas, Tennessee, West Virginia.

NOTES α

- φ CT “Training in the dynamics of ageing. Education that not all families are not out for "the best" of the parent.”
- φ IL “Education on vulnerable adult abuse, on APS and need to respond aggressively to these cases.”
- φ SD “Judges must educate themselves from within. They should take these cases seriously.”
- φ TN “Specific training for judges.”
- φ TX “APS collaboration with medical community.”
“More use of mediation/dispute resolution.”
- φ WV “Cross training on how best to collaborate in these and all APS/exploitation cases.”

SUMMARY TABLE α

CATEGORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
More staff and other resources for criminal justice agencies:	12	36.7%
Collaborative support during the investigation from APS multi-disciplinary teams:	12	36.7%
Cross training with judges on responding to financial exploitation cases:	28	84.8%
Other:	6	18.8%
Total (N=)	33	94.3%

REPORT END

Participating States

The following states submitted completed surveys.

- | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Alabama | 13. Kansas | 25. Oregon |
| 2. Arizona | 14. Louisiana 1 | 26. Pennsylvania |
| 3. Arkansas | 15. Louisiana 2 | 27. South Carolina |
| 4. California | 16. Maine | 28. South Dakota |
| 5. Connecticut | 17. Mississippi | 29. Tennessee |
| 6. Delaware | 18. Missouri | 30. Texas |
| 7. Florida | 19. Nebraska | 31. Utah |
| 8. Georgia | 20. Nevada | 32. Washington |
| 9. Guam | 21. New Mexico | 33. West Virginia |
| 10. Hawaii | 22. North Carolina | 34. Wisconsin |
| 11. Illinois | 23. North Dakota | 35. Wyoming |
| 12. Iowa | 24. Ohio | |

Nonparticipating States

The following states did not submit completed surveys.

1. Alaska
2. Colorado
3. District of Columbia
4. Kentucky
5. Maryland
6. Massachusetts
7. Minnesota
8. Mississippi
9. Montana
10. New Hampshire
11. New Jersey
12. New Mexico
13. New York
14. North Carolina
15. Oklahoma
16. Puerto Rico
17. Rhode Island
18. South Carolina
19. Vermont
20. Washington
21. West Virginia