



# SOUTHERN AREA CONSORTIUM OF HUMAN SERVICES

## National Examples: Existing Adult Protective Services (APS) Performance Measures

Anita Harbert, Ph.D.  
*Principal Investigator*

*Executive Director – Academy for Professional Excellence*  
*Professor Emeritus – SDSU School of Social Work*

Donald Dudley, MSW  
*Co-Principal Investigator*

*Director, Academy for Professional Excellence*

**Prepared by:**  
Karissa Erbes, MSW

**November 2008**



SACHS is a program of the  
*Academy for Professional Excellence at*  
San Diego State University School of Social Work.  
6505 Alvarado Road, Suite 107 / San Diego, CA 92120  
<http://theacademy.sdsu.edu>



### **Proposed Goals for APS Program Reform**

(Adapted from: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services APS Program Performance Report-July 2008, available at: [http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01\\_APS-Report.pdf](http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01_APS-Report.pdf) )

1. **Client Outcomes\***  
*Enhance outcomes for clients via systemic reform of the APS program. Support new assessment tools, clinical expertise, and quality assurance provisions to help ensure client safety and well-being.*
2. **Performance Management**  
*Develop a Performance Management system to monitor case quality. Use gathered performance data to inform management, policies and training in order to improve case outcomes for clients.*
3. **Community Engagement**  
*Implement regional and statewide APS community engagement outreach and efforts to enhance public awareness and participation in an attempt to improve client's safety and well-being.*
4. **Training**  
*Revise and expand training curricula and methods to improve caseworkers' knowledge and skills resulting in better case decisions and enhanced outcomes for clients.*
5. **Technological Innovation**  
*Utilize innovative technologies to improve caseworker efficiency and effectiveness in completing client assessments, consultation and documentation.*
6. **Staffing**  
*Allocate additional staff resources to the APS program in order to facilitate manageable caseloads, improve performance (e.g. reduce duration of investigations and length of time to service delivery) to enhance client outcomes.*

\*Texas APS Program is currently conducting an evaluation of reform to examine how programmatic changes have impacted the quality of services to the clients and communities they serve. The evaluation report should be completed during the second quarter of FY 2009.

### **APS Performance Measurement**

(Source: Romero, M. 2004. *Utilization Assessment of The Texas Performance Measurement System*. Available online at <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/arp/26/>)

Why Measure APS Performance?

- To continuously improve services
- To strengthen accountability
- To communicate results of programs and services
- To provide better information for effective decision-making including resource allocation

APS Performance Measures Should Meet the Following Criteria:

- Be results-oriented: focus primarily on outcomes, efficiencies, and outputs
- Be selective: concentrate on the most important indicators of performance
- Be useful: provide information of value to the agency and decision-makers
- Be accessible: provide periodic information about results
- Be reliable: provide accurate, consistent information over time
- Be quantifiable and measurable
- Be relevant, understandable, timely, consistent, and comparable

**Performance Measures Defined**

(Source: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. 2006. *Performance Measure Definitions-FY2008-2009*. Austin, TX)

Type	Definition
<b>Outcome</b>	A quantifiable indicator of the clients' benefit from the agency's action
<b>Output</b>	A quantifiable indicator of the number of goods or services an agency produces
<b>Efficiency</b>	A quantifiable indicator of productivity expressed in unit costs, units of time or other ratio-based units
<b>Explanatory</b>	An indicator of factors, agency resources, or requests received that affect an agency's performance

**Texas Legislative Budget Board (LBB) Performance Measures for APS**

(Sources: DFPS Management Reporting and Statistics-Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2007, available at, <http://intranet.dfps.state.tx.us/Operations/PMI/aps.asp>; Texas Department of Family and Protective Services APS Program Performance Report-July 2008, available at: [http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01\\_APS-Report.pdf](http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01_APS-Report.pdf) )

The following LBB metrics are intended as aggregate measures of the entire APS program. The metrics listed in bold are “key measures,” those the LBB identifies as most important. They must be reported on quarterly basis, while the rest are computed and reported annually. The table below lists the Texas APS program performance measures for FYs: 2006-2007; 2007-2008 (performance measures on the subjects of institutional investigation and conservatorships have been removed from the below list, for improved relevancy to the State of California).

Type	Specific Performance Measure
Outcome	<b>Incidence of Adult Abuse/Neglect/ Exploitation per 1,000 persons</b>
Outcome	<b>Percent of Adults Found to be Abused/Neglected/Exploited Who Are Served</b>
Outcome	APS Case Recidivism
Efficiency	<b>Average Monthly Cost per APS Investigation</b>
Efficiency	<b>Average Monthly Cost per APS Case</b>
Efficiency	Average APS Caseload per Worker
Efficiency	<b>APS Workload Equivalency (WEM)</b>
Efficiency	Average Hold Time Statewide Intake Phone Calls (English)
Efficiency	Average Days per Investigation Stage
Efficiency	Average Days per Service Delivery Stage
Explanatory	Percent of APS Workers with Two or More Years of Service
Explanatory	Number of APS Clients Receiving Protective Services
Output	<b>Number of Completed APS Investigations</b>
Output	<b>Number of Confirmed APS Investigations</b>
Output	Average Number of Open APS Investigations per Month
Output	Average Number of APS Cases Open for Protective Services
Output	Number of APS Reports of Adult Abuse/Neglect/Exploitation
Output	Number of MH and MR Reports of Abuse/Neglect/Exploitation

**Colorado-Multnomah County APS Performance Measures (Feb. 2008)**  
 (Available at: <http://www2.co.multnomah.or.us/aspnet/budgetwebFY09/PDF/25024-MINT.pdf>)

Measure Type	Primary Measure
Output	Protective services investigations completed
Outcome	Re-abuse rate for elderly & people with disabilities
Output	Clients with improved living situation after 90 days of MDT intervention
Output	Clients with improved mental health status following 90 days of intervention*

\*This measure was recently removed because of change in contractor for MDT Mental Health specialists.  
*Note:* The Colorado Department of Social Services requires next day response on all abuse allegations.

**California-San Diego County APS Performance Measures**

- Ensure 95% of all APS cases receive a face-to-face contact within 10 days of referral.
- Ensure at least 80% of all APS cases open more than 30 days receive a timely face-to-face visit.
- Ensure 91% of all APS cases are not re-referred within six months of case closing.

**Texas APS-Employee Centered Performance Measure (2008)**

(Source: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services APS Program Performance Report-July 2008, available at: [http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01\\_APS-Report.pdf](http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Documents/about/Presentations/2008-07-01_APS-Report.pdf) )

**Statewide Intake**

- Appropriately obtains and documents detailed information from reporters
- Assesses and prioritizes reports of abuse/neglect accurately
- Accurately distributes reports, information and inquiries within timeframes

**Investigation**

- Percentage of cases initiated within 24 hours.
- Percentage of cases in which the initial client face-to-face visit occurred within the appropriate timeframe.
- Investigation Rating Scale Completed\*

**Risk Assessment**

- Thoroughness of problem identification
- Adequacy of supporting documentation

**Delivery of Protective Services**

- Client Intervention Scale\*

\*The quality assurance scales-*Investigation* and *Client Intervention*, are used to measure worker performance and represent scores for ten standards assessed during case reading analysis.

*Note:* For a detailed grid of the above APS Caseworker Performance Measures used during employee performance reviews (including the performance rating scales) by position, please refer to **Appendix A.**

**Texas APS- Key Actions to Enhance the Protection of the Elderly and those with Disabilities (FY 2006):**

(Source: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services APS Program Performance Report-Feb. 2007)

As of September 1, 2006, 100 percent of the 252 APS reform corrective actions\* were completed by the State of Texas. The following section provides a high level overview of the completed APS reform initiatives.

**Client Outcomes**

- Risk Assessment tool developed to assess five domains related to client safety and well-being.
- Six full-time case analysts employed to evaluate case quality.
- Exploitation and self-neglect Experts employed in each region.
- Mandatory supervisory review established for all cases before closure.
- Special task units developed to monitor complex investigations in counties with a population greater than 250,000.

**Performance Management**

- Employee performance standards developed for all APS employees.
- Comprehensive performance management reporting system devised to provide managers and caseworkers with timely performance updates.
- Quarterly performance reports submitted to the Governor's Office and Legislature.
- Training on the new performance management system provided for all managers.

**Community Engagement**

- Community Initiative Specialists and Resource and External Relations Specialists employed in each region.
- Community action plans developed to address community education and resource development.
- Public awareness campaign produced in collaboration with public and private partnerships.
- Community stakeholders surveyed in FY 2004 and again in FY 2006 in order to solicit input regarding APS services.

**Technological Innovation**

- Tablet PCs distributed to all direct-delivery staff in the APS in-home and APS facility programs.
- Mobile Protective Services software developed enabling caseworkers to document case activities outside of their office.
- Digital cameras provided to all field staff.
- Plan developed to evaluate tablet PC usage in a mobile office environment.
- Plan developed to measure the impact tablet PCs have had on program performance.

**Guardianship\*\***

- Guardianship program transferred to Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS).
- Memorandum of Understanding developed between DFPS and DADS.
- DFPS and DADS formed Guardianship Executive Steering Committee.

### **Staffing**

- Additional FTEs allocated for FYs 2005-2006.
- Pre-screening instituted during the hiring process.
- Interview process standardized for direct-delivery staff.
- Education stipend made available to all APS staff.
- Higher Education Coordinating Board collaboration improved degree programs aimed at adult protection.
- Recruitment efforts developed targeting individuals educated in fields related to adult protection.
- Enhanced retention efforts aimed at APS field staff.
- Plan established to hire additional staff allocated for FY 2007.

### **Caseload Management**

- Increase in client intakes monitored and a caseload reduction plan developed for addressing excessive workloads.
- Best practice initiatives researched and plan implemented to address pending cases.

### **Training**

- 11-week training program expanded from previous three-week program.
- 29 web-based training modules used in conjunction with supervised on-the-job training.
- Nine field trainers employed to supervise new employees during on-the-job training.
- Three weeks of advanced classroom training offered.
- 18 hours of continuing education training developed for all direct-delivery staff and supervisors.
- Comprehensive training on risk assessment and mobile technology provided.
- Annual training implemented for all field staff.

#### **\* How were the 252 corrective actions determined?**

In 2004, several Adult Protective Services cases in El Paso and Tarrant County attracted the attention of the news media and elected officials. As a result, the Governor issued Executive Order RP 33 on April 14, 2004. The order called for the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to complete the following review:

- A review of more than 1,200 case files involving 200 clients within the last two years that had three or more referrals to APS;
- A review of APS management structure, policy, internal reports, data analysis, personnel records, and statutes related to APS;
- Follow-up visits with clients to verify that information in case files was accurate; and
- Interviews with staff and community leaders.

\*\* This indicates that Texas moved guardianship out of APS due to a conflict of interest – this is already the case in California. In California many counties are either co-locating APS and Public Guardian or placing them within the same organizational hierarchy. However, California does need to look at the interface between APS and Public Guardian because it is the source of problems for APS workers.

**Texas APS Program-Responding to the Challenges of Implementing Performance Management in APS**

(Source: Este, Stephen, "The Challenges of Accountability in the Human Services: Performance Management in the Adult Protective Services Program of Texas" (2007). *Applied Research Projects*. Paper 250. Full report available for download at: <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/arp/250> )

*Summary:*

- Looking at both the literature of performance management and the case of the Texas Adult Protective Services (APS) program, the research found that some of the challenges in managing performance in “people programs” lies in organizational culture-an emphasis on direct interaction with clients over the effective documentation.
- Public human services agency functions are often hampered by an inadequate emphasis on the collection and use of performance information and a frequent lack of clarity or agreement as to their core missions.
- Research explored significant challenges the Adult Protective Services Program faces in general in addition to challenges in implementing performance management system.
- Highlighted approach and strategies that the Texas APS program developed for building their sustainable and accepted system.
  - Performance standards were developed that directly supported organizational goals of better client services, and improved accountability of all employees.
  - In developing a performance management system, the Texas APS program put a strong emphasis on field employee participation; ease of use, relevance and consistency, and in developing tools to measure what had previously been ruled immeasurable.
- The Texas performance-based budgeting system is often cited as a model for implementing accountability in state government

**Appendix A: Grid-Caseworker Performance Measures**

(Source: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS). 2005. *Adult Protective Services Performance Management Training Manual*. Austin.)

**Tenured In-Home Worker (over 18 month's tenure)**

<b>Task # and Type</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Standard</b>
1. Investigation (Quantitative)	Caseworker will initiate each case within 24 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 98% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 96%-98% = Commendable</li> <li>• 94%-95% = Competent</li> <li>• 92%-93% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 92% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>
2. Investigation (Quantitative) macaroni	Caseworker will make face-to-face contacts within policy timeframes for the priority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 94% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 92%-94% = Commendable</li> <li>• 89%-91% = Competent</li> <li>• 80%-88% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 80% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>
3. Investigation (Qualitative)	Caseworker will fully investigate allegations and all factors that present a threat to the client's health or safety.	<p>Investigation Scale average for the sample of cases read during the review period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 93% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 87% - 93% = Commendable</li> <li>• 80%-86% = Competent</li> <li>• 73%-79% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 73% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>
4. Service delivery (Quantitative)	Caseworkers will contact client at least once a month while the case is open in both investigation and service delivery stages.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 94% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 92%-94% = Commendable</li> <li>• 89%-91% = Competent</li> <li>• 80%-88% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 80% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>

**Tenured In-Home Worker (over 18 month’s tenure) (Continued)**

<b>Task # and Type</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Standard</b>
5. Service delivery (Qualitative)	Caseworker will work to alleviate the client’s state of a/n/e and remove threats to client’s health and safety by designing and implementing, a service plan that addresses problems identified during the investigation.	Client Outcome Scale average for all cases read during the review period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 93% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 87% - 93% = Commendable</li> <li>• 80%-86% = Competent</li> <li>• 73%-79% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 73% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>
6. Process Compliance (Qualitative)	Caseworker will meet deadlines, perform consultations and notifications, and document casework according to policy.	Process Compliance Scale average for all cases read during the review period above <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 93% = Distinguished</li> <li>• 87% - 93% = Commendable</li> <li>• 80%-86% = Competent</li> <li>• 73%-79% = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Below 73% = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>
7. Training (Quantitative)	Caseworker will maintain current knowledge of development in the professional of Adult Protection and related fields to best meet the needs the needs of clients and the mission of APS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competent= Caseworker completes continuing education each year as required by legislation and APS program expectations, unless availability of training or other circumstances prevent it.</li> <li>• Needs Improvement= Despite opportunities, caseworker fails complete continuing education each year as required by legislation and APS program expectations</li> </ul>

**In-Home Worker, First Six Months**

There are only two job-specific tasks for supervisors to use at the six-month evaluations, in addition to the dimensions.

<b>Task # and Type</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Standard</b>
1. Training (Quantitative)	Communication from ASD classroom trainer that caseworker has completed BLAST, ILSD and ASD and is ready to begin working cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion = Competent</li> <li>• Not complete at six months = Needs Improvement</li> </ul>

**Tenured In-Home Worker (First Six Months) (Continued)**

Task # and Type	Task	Standard
2. Training (Qualitative)	Caseworker will continue to acquire basic casework skills.	The supervisor's assessment of the caseworker's progress in acquiring basic casework skills, based on such casereading data as may exist and feedback about the worker from trainers or fellow caseworkers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly superior progress = Distinguished</li> <li>• Better than average progress = Commendable</li> <li>• Adequate progress = Competent</li> <li>• Less than average progress = Needs Some Improvement</li> <li>• Inadequate progress = Needs Major Improvement</li> </ul>

**In-Home Worker at One Year**

The tenured worker tasks will be applied in the one-year evaluation (in addition to the dimensions). There will be one additional task:

Task # and Type	Task	Standard
3. Training (Quantitative)	Caseworker will complete all required training.	Transcript or report showing that caseworker has completed required training for second six months of employment (Cultural Diversity, Exploitation), unless availability of training or other circumstances prevented it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion = Competent</li> <li>• Not complete at one year despite opportunity to do so = Needs Improvement</li> </ul>

**In-Home Worker at 18 Months**

The tenured worker tasks will be applied in the 18-month evaluation (in addition to the dimensions).

The dimensions include:

- Initiative
- Planning and Organization
- Decision-Making
- Flexibility and Adaptability
- Communication and Interpersonal Skills
- Professionalism