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### Project Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>La Mesa Pilot Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Statement:</td>
<td>Adult Protective Services (APS) has had a steady increase in referrals over the past several years. Causes for the increase may be attributed to an increase in the aging population, mandated reporters, the economic crisis and an increase in immigrant refugees. In the meantime, Adult Protective Services is poorly funded and notoriously known for having a shortage in staff. Without increased funding Adult Protective Social Workers are being heavily impacted. Social workers are receiving an average of 24-30 cases per month which equates to a 29.9% increase in workload from years past. There has been an increase in social worker “burn-out” and a decrease in morale. Knowing that the workload would not decrease we needed to determine how to better manage the current workload while assisting our workers with burn-out and morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Project?</td>
<td>Streamline Adult Protective Services investigative process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers:</td>
<td>APS client, Adult Protective Services Specialists, Call Center staff, APS Supervisors, Mandated Reporters, Community Partners, Internal Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Expected Benefits: | Increase in Morale  
Increase in thorough investigations  
Salary of 1 APSS  
1 Week/Month of work |
| Costs and Return on Investment: | None |
The Project Team

**Project Lead:** Carol Castillon

**Project Sponsor:** Ellen Schmeding, Deputy Director for Aging & Independence Services

**Core Team Members:**
- Hung Nguyen - Senior APSS
- Sharon Adams-Clark - PT APSS
- Lynn Calhoon - APSS
- Ileana Guerena - APSS
- Dina Hernandez - APSS
- Marianne Hommel - APSS
- Elena Insunza - APSS
- Marenda Pringle - APSS
- Elizabeth Robles - APSS

Project Risks & Costs

**Subject Matter Experts:**
- Former APS Program Manager: Jennifer Bransford-Koons
- Current APS Program Manager: Chris Alire
- APS Assignment Supervisor: Carlos Morales
- South Bay APS Supervisor: Eileen Mcnair

**Project Risks:**
Line staff may resent change, difficult to adapt to change

**Project Costs:** None
Voice Of Customer

INPUT FROM STAFF

- Locating a client
- Contacting Reporting Party
- Contacting collaterals
- Mailing and referring referrals
- Interpreter requests
- Making FTF contact with clients who do not have a protective issue
- NIFFI/ENI cases
- Decrease in morale in investigating cases a worker feels “weakened”
- As a team we reviewed the process in which a worker received the case and found that workers typically did not screen cases prior to attempting an unannounced home visit. This opened up a huge margin where variation could occur. Per staff, they did not have time to do this.

THEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Pre-Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Protective Issue</td>
<td>Assessing NIFFI/ENI Cases</td>
<td>Contacting RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases not appropriate for APS</td>
<td>*Location of client</td>
<td>Cross Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate information</td>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter Requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Collaterals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SIPOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Customer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Party</td>
<td>• Call Center enters data</td>
<td>• Case activated</td>
<td>• Social Services Provided</td>
<td>• APS clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case screened through SDM</td>
<td>• Investigated</td>
<td></td>
<td>• APSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LE Referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td>• APS Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mandated Reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assignment team screens

Case assigned

* In some cases, referral is reviewed

FTF attempt is made
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Adult Protective Services Case Process

**Case Screened (time permits)**

**Case Assigned to APSS “C” status**

APSS will attempt FTF

Approval requested for NIFFI/ENI

Case Closed

**Case Screened**

Case identified as NIFFI/ENI

Time Permits (Pre-work Completed)

APSS will identify case as NIFFI/ENI

Decision

Call Center

Referral Generated

Decision

APSS will assign case to APSS “C” status

Output

Case worked as NIFFI/ENI

**Case Screened**
Initial Data Collection

• South Bay APS (Control Group)
• La Mesa APS (Experimental Group)

• **Time study**

• Survey Monkey
Required vs. Other

TIME STUDY

- Required: 79%
- Other: 21%
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CAUSE AND EFFECT

Measurements

- Short staffed
- Record # referrals
- Timeline mandates
- Screen cases

Communication

- Right questions at intake
- Verify address
- Protective Issue
- Clarification from RP

Increase in non-value added time

Process

- Not enough time
- SW Burn out
- Cross report resources

People

- Sup support
- SDM
- NIFFI/ENI training
- Cross reports

Tools

- NIFFI/ENI status
- Timeline mandates
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## POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><strong>Hire more staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>Training for Call Center Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><strong>Emphasis on intake and triage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>Implement “pre-interview” phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>Pilot group with “intake” emphasis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SOLUTIONS

With a potential solution in hand I went back to the team.

After some discussion, pro’s and con’s list, the team agreed to participate.
IMPROVEMENT PHASE

TIMEFRAME: 04/2012-11/2012

• Baseline will be obtained from Sept 2011- Feb 2012.
• April 2012- Jun 2012 will allow workers to learn and adjust to new roles and to work-out any issues that may arise.
• Stats pulled at baseline will be pulled again December 2012.

TRAINING:

• Intake workers will complete ride-alongs/training with the assignment team for an estimated 1-2 weeks.
• Structured Decision Making training.
• Units Involved: South Bay will act as control group. Both units will undergo a NIFFI/ENI training prior to roll out. Dawn Gibbons-McWayne will complete the training.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
LMPP Process

**Assignment**
- Would automatically refer all cases to Supervisor/Sr. Worker

**SUP. & “Intake Team”**
- Supervisor and intake team will review each case
- Intake will “clear” the case.

**INTAKE**
- Cases that were found appropriate would be referred with completed **intake packet**.
- Cases were MDT’d with Sup for appropriate cross referrals
- Case were placed in NIFFI/ENI status ***48 hour rule

**SUP**
- A **point value** was added to each case assigned to account for an equitable workload
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At first...

- Accurate address & verification
- SDLAW- Increase in arrests
- Allegations were teased out
- Companion cases were identified quicker
- Cases that required “merges” were also identified quicker
- ENI/NIFFI
2\textsuperscript{nd} Phase Data Collection

- The project ran for 6 months
- A final time study was collected
- Timeliness of case notes
- 30 day face-to-face
- 10 day face-to-face
- Survey Monkey
Referrals, ENI/NIFFI, Average Caseload

Referrals
ENI/NIFFI
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Case Note Timeliness

Review of Case Notes

La Mesa
- 91.2%
- 30,989

Southbay
- 96.7%
- 17,937
Time Study (LM)
10 Day FTF

- During Pilot: 93.5% in compliance
- Pre-Pilot: 92.7% in compliance

April 12 - November 12

Total terminated: 1025, Total seen within 10 days: 958

October 11 - March 12

Total terminated: 1170, Total seen within 10 days: 1084
Call Center Trends

CALL CENTER

UCL = 0.119554
LCL = 0.021646
CEN = 0.070620
Survey Monkey

• Areas of success
  – Locating the client
  – NIFFI/ENI
  – Appropriate referrals
  – Assessing protective issues
  – RP/Collateral contacts
Survey Monkey Cont..

• 72% - More appropriate referrals

• 93% - Served clients in need

• 58% - Worked to their strengths

• 64% - LMPP was successful in triaging cases
7 Point Supervisor Questionnaire
If work load was not an issue, would the case benefit from additional APS services?

**Question 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the scale below, what level of risk will the client remain with?

**Question #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>No Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is the likelihood that the client will follow-up with referrals provided by APS?
How long was the case active for?

(Less than 30 days) (30-45) (46-60) (Over 60 days)
Lessons Learned

• Weighted case loads does not work for APS.
• Assigning to workers based on short term and long term status does not work for APS.
• Assigning to workers based on preference to allegation and strength was successful.
  – Boost in morale
• Initiating the project enhanced communication amongst staff.
• The biggest success was triage at intake.
Final Solutions

• A dedicated **Intake Team**.

• Facilitate training for the Call Center outliers.
Questions??