



NAMRS FFY 2016 Report 1.2: Agency Component

May 5, 2018



Acknowledgements

The Administration for Community Living gratefully acknowledges the voluntary submission of data to the National Adult Maltreatment Reporting System (NAMRS) by the States, District of Columbia, and Territories. Without the support of the Adult Protective Services staff, supervisors, and program administrators' collection of data and reporting into state systems, it would have been impossible to have achieved the historical, first submission of data (FFY 2016) into the National Adult Maltreatment Reporting System.

In addition, we applaud the work of the:

- Elder Justice Coordinating Council in making the collection of data regarding adult maltreatment a priority issue;
- Department of Health and Human Services' Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation for support of the initial development and piloting of NAMRS; and
- Numerous experts, university faculty, medical researchers, and national organizations representing the field of adult maltreatment who provided guidance on NAMRS development.

Suggested Citation:

Acker, D., Aurelien, G., Beatrice, M., Capehart, A., Gassoumis, Z., Ph.D., Gervais Voss, P., Greene, M., Phillippi, M. (2018). NAMRS FFY2016 Report 1.2: Agency Component. Administration for Community Living, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Washington, D.C.

Disclaimer:

This project was funded by the Administration for Community Living under contract number HHS-P233201500042I to WRMA, Inc. The statements contained in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human Services and Administration for Community Living.



Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	iii
Agency Component Data.....	1
(AC-1) Agency Component Submission Rates	1
(AC-2) Data Source	1
(AC-3) Staff	2
(AC-4) Intake Model.....	3
(AC-5) Reports.....	3
(AC-6) Time (Days).....	4
(AC-7) Maltreatment Types.....	4
(AC-8) Standard of Evidence.....	5
(AC-9) Assessment Tool.....	5
(AC-10) Service Gaps.....	6

Executive Summary

The statistics in this report are based on data submitted to NAMRS, which is a voluntary reporting system that was developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living. In FFY 2016, 54 APS reporting jurisdictions volunteered to participate by providing information and data. For NAMRS, a reporting jurisdiction is the officially designated APS office in the state, territory, or district.

The Agency Component report offers an overview of the policies and practices of state APS agencies. In addition to submitting the data elements highlighted in this report, states provided narratives regarding statutes, policies and procedures, investigative practices, data systems, intake processes, staffing, training, and client assessments. Narrative information such as state statutes, policies, training, etc. will be used in developing future discussion papers.

Additional information gleaned from the initial year of NAMRS data submissions can be accessed in the following reports:

- NAMRS FY 2016 Background Report: This report discusses the development of the NAMRS data system, provides an overview of the data elements and the data submission process, and discusses the known limitations and future directions of NAMRS.
- NAMRS FY 2016 Report 2: Key Indicators: Key Indicators Report presents data from 44 states, a combination of data from 20 states that provided aggregate Key Indicator data and 24 other states that provided case-level data for the same key indicator elements. The aggregated data pertains to client, victim, and perpetrators.
- NAMRS FY 2016 Report 3: Case Components: Case Component provides a summary of case level information for investigations of maltreatments, clients, victims, services, and perpetrators. Additionally, Report 3 presents a review of cross tabulations of certain data elements relevant to victims with a substantiated maltreatment type.

A final note on limitations of the FFY 2016 data reports. In this first year of a new, national reporting system, care was taken to explain how many states were able to submit information; the percentage of individual data elements provided; and to describe limitations discovered when reviewing data. For FY 2016, no state could provide all Case Component, nor all Key Indicators, data elements, and no two states reported on all of the same data elements. Furthermore, as NAMRS was developed to allow maximum flexibility for states to be able to report data in a way that did not increase burden for the states' participation, data contained in the exhibit tables will not always total 100%. Agency and Key Indicator data have aggregate totals, which contain duplicate counts of clients, victims, and perpetrators. The Case Component data, conversely, are unique. Case Component data consists of client characteristics, services, and perpetrator characteristics, provided by states that have report-level tracking systems. For these reasons, readers are cautioned against attempting to compare or combine data reported in Agency, Key Indicator, or Case Components.

Agency Component Data

The Agency Component report offers information about the uniqueness of each state program. The NAMRS Agency Component has 12 data elements that include seven numerical fields and five optional narrative fields. The following exhibit reflects response rates for the data elements. The optional narrative fields allow states to describe unique state statutes, policies, populations served, and method(s) of data collection. The narrative submissions are not included in this report. ACL decided that in the initial years of reporting to NAMRS, individual states would not be identified, and that the report would reflect national information about the reported maltreatments of adults.

(AC-1) Agency Component Submission Rates

“Exhibit AC-1 Agency Component Submission Rates” lists each of the Agency Component data elements. Additionally, the exhibit lists the number of states that submitted each data element; the percentage of states out of the possible 56 states that submitted the data elements; and the percentage of states out of the possible 54 states which submitted the specific data elements.

Exhibit AC- 1 Agency Component Submission Rates


Data Element	# of states that submitted	% of states (56)	% of states that submitted (54)
Data Source (AC-2)	52	92.9%	96.3%
Investigator FTEs filled (AC-3)	47	83.9%	87.0%
Supervisor FTEs filled (AC-3)	44	78.6%	81.5%
Intake Model(AC-4)	53	94.6%	98.1%
Reports Accepted for Investigation (AC-5)	49	87.5%	90.7%
Reports Not Accepted or I&R/I&RA (AC-5)	42	75.0%	77.8%
Response Time (AC-6)	45	80.4%	83.3%
Completion Time (AC-6)	39	69.6%	72.2%
Maltreatment Types (AC-7)	53	94.6%	98.1%
Standard of Evidence (AC-8)	50	89.3%	92.6%
Assessment Tool (AC-9)	51	91.1%	94.4%
Services Gaps (AC-10)	24	42.9%	44.4%

(AC-2) Data Source

The data source represents the entity from which the data was gathered. Examples of APS and Other Agencies include, but is not limited to, agencies responsible for maltreatment investigations, licensing and certification agencies, and regulatory authorities. States’ statutory authority varies for investigations of maltreatments of older adults based upon age, disability, and place of residence. For example, investigations of maltreatment reports adults 60 and older may be

investigated by the department of aging services; adults 18 to 59 with a disability may be investigated by the department of behavioral health and development disabilities; and adults 18 and older living in licensed long-term care facilities by the licensing and certification of facilities agency. The state point of contact for reporting to NAMRS is the APS program. If the APS program was able to report adult maltreatment data from other state agencies responsible for investigating maltreatments, they worked with the other agencies to submit one state report to NAMRS.

“Exhibit AC-2 Data Source” pie chart depicts that 46, or 88.5%, of the states had only one data reporting source, which was the APS data system. Six, or 11.5%, of the states submitted data gathered from the APS data system and at least one other reporting agency’s system.



(AC-3) Staff


“Exhibit AC-3– Staff” reflects the number of states that were able to provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) positions for investigators and supervisors. Narratives provided by some states explained that supervisors also carry an investigative case load.

Exhibit AC- 2 Staff

Staff	# of states that submitted	% of states (56)	FTE Count	Count of 44 states that provided both	% of states (44)	Ratio Investigators to Supervisors
Investigator FTEs Filled	47	83.9%	6,079	4,859	80.5%	4 : 1
Supervisor FTEs Filled	44	78.6%	1,180	1,180	19.5%	

(AC-4) Intake Model

A centralized intake hotline or call-in number provides a single point of entry for reports of maltreatments. Decentralized options include regional or county hotlines or reporting numbers. In “Exhibit AC-4 Intake Model,” 24, or 45.3%, of the states have a centralized, state-wide system for receiving reports. Sixteen, or 30.2%, of states have a combination of both a centralized and decentralized (local) reporting system. Eleven, or 20.8%, of states have local systems established for reporting of adult maltreatments. Two, or 3.8%, of states have a different arrangement, other than state-wide or local systems, for receipts of reports. The two different arrangements were a model for intake of reports by law enforcement and another of rotation of responsibility by APS investigators.



(AC-5) Reports

Reports of maltreatment that APS received were assessed at intake for next steps: either (1) accept for investigation and/or assessment for intervention and services; or (2) provide information, assistance, and referral to other services. “Exhibit AC-5– Reports” displays how many states could report this data; the number of reports accepted for investigation during the FFY 2016; and the number of reports not accepted for investigation during the FFY 2016, but instead callers were provided information and referral/information and referral assistance.

Whether a state investigates all reports of maltreatment is decided upon by state statutory authority and APS program state rules and regulations. States’ statutes may specify populations served, adults with certain types of disabilities, or where the adult lives as a basis for investigating the allegation or providing information and assistance.

Exhibit AC- 3 Reports

Reports	# of states that submitted	% of states (56)	Count	Count of 42 states (submitted both)	Total Count of 42 states	% of states (42)
Accepted for Investigation	49	87.5%	728,049	556,730	1,499,043	37.1%
Not Accepted or I&R/I&RA	42	75.0%	942,313	942,313		62.9%

(AC-6) Time (Days)

The response time is the length of time from receipt by APS of an alleged maltreatment to APS contact with the client. The completion time is the length of time in days from investigation start to investigation completion. “Exhibit AC-6 Time (Days)” displays how many states were able to report on the data element and what was the average response and completion times.

Exhibit AC- 4 Time (Days)

Time (Days)	# of states that submitted	% of states (56)	Average Days
Response Time	45	80.4%	4.2
Completion Time	39	69.6%	47.0

(AC-7) Maltreatment Types

Each state has distinct laws and policies defining what types of adult maltreatment the APS program will investigate or assess. The NAMRS maltreatment types are listed in “Exhibit AC-7 Maltreatment Types.” Twenty states reported additional maltreatment types, not listed as NAMRS data elements. Examples of other maltreatment types submitted by states include abduction, confinement/isolation, coercion, and treatment without consent. See definitions of maltreatment types in *Appendix A: Data Element and Value Definitions*.


Exhibit AC- 5 Maltreatment Types

Maltreatment Types	# of states that selected type	% of states (56)	% of states that submitted (53)
Abandonment	24	42.9%	45.3%
Emotional Abuse	41	73.2%	77.4%
Exploitation (non-specific)	28	50.0%	52.8%
Financial Exploitation	44	78.6%	83.0%
Other Exploitation	23	41.1%	43.4%
Neglect	53	94.6%	100.0%

Maltreatment Types	# of states that selected type	% of states (56)	% of states that submitted (53)
Physical Abuse	51	91.1%	96.2%
Sexual Abuse	47	83.9%	88.7%
Suspicious Death	10	17.9%	18.9%
Self-Neglect	50	89.3%	94.3%
Other Types	20	35.7%	37.7%

(AC-8) Standard of Evidence

States have distinct laws and policies defining what standard of evidence is used for substantiating (determining) an allegation of maltreatment. Based on their statute, a few states do not investigate or make a substantiation (determination) of alleged maltreatment reports. Instead, staff assess a person for risk of maltreatment and need for protective services. “Exhibit AC-8 Standard of Evidence” depicts which standard of evidence is followed by states.




(AC-9) Assessment Tool

Each state has policies defining whether APS personnel use standard assessment tools throughout the state, such as client safety, at-risk factors, or behavioral conditions assessment tools. “Unless specifically qualified or authorized by state law, an APS worker does not carry out clinical health or capacity assessments, but rather screens for indications of impairment, and, as needed, refers

the client on to qualified professionals (physicians, neuropsychologists, etc.) to administer thorough evaluations.”¹

Thirty-nine, or 76.5%, of the states do have a statewide standard assessment tool used by all staff. States may provide an array of approved assessment tools and allow the staff to determine the appropriate assessments to use with each client. Twelve, or 23.5%, of the states reporting do not have common assessment tools used by all staff.



(AC-10) Service Gaps

The information provided on client service gaps reflects the APS programs’ efforts to arrange, provide, or make referrals for needed services for clients/victims. Service gaps are an indication that services are limited or may not be available. Some states provided comments about service gaps. Common statements were (1) waiting lists for receipt of services, (2) services available in urban areas but not the rural areas of the state, and (3) lack of transportation, especially in rural areas, make the services inaccessible. Exhibit AC-10 below lists the service gaps that states identified as existing in their areas.

¹ Administration for Community Living, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Final National Voluntary Consensus Guidelines for States Adult Protective Services Systems*, September 2016.

Exhibit AC- 6 Service Gaps (N = 24)

Service Gaps	# of states that selected service	% of states (56)	% of states that submitted (24)
Care/Case Management Services	10	17.9%	41.7%
Caregiver Support Services	11	19.6%	45.8%
Community Day Services	11	19.6%	45.8%
Education, Employment, and Training Services	7	12.5%	29.2%
Emergency Assistance and Material Aid Services	11	19.6%	45.8%
Financial Planning Services	13	23.2%	54.2%
Housing and Relocation Services	19	33.9%	79.2%
In-Home Assistance Services	10	17.9%	41.7%
Legal Services	12	21.4%	50.0%
Medical and Dental Services	10	17.9%	41.7%
Medical Rehabilitation Services	8	14.3%	33.3%
Mental Health Services	15	26.8%	62.5%
Nutrition Services	9	16.1%	37.5%
Public Assistance Benefits Services	6	10.7%	25.0%
Substance Use Services	10	17.9%	41.7%
Transportation Services	14	25.0%	58.3%
Victim Services	8	14.3%	33.3%
Other Services	8	14.3%	33.3%

End of NAMRS FFY 2016 Report 1.2: Agency Component