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Our story...
How is California different?

- County administered/ 58 separate counties
- The “state” of Los Angeles = 27% of the states APS cases
- 7 counties bigger/ more populated than most states (together with LA have 10% of nation’s elders!)
- 20 small rural counties with, on average, less than 20 on-going cases
LA is bigger than...
Which states do not have a statewide data system? (And aren’t currently working on one)
What happens at the state level?
New APS State Liaison position

- Providing leadership and coordination
- Updating APS Regulations
- Monitoring new funding for training
- Addressing statewide data gaps
State – County APS Collaboration

- County Welfare Directors Association
- Protective Services Operations Committee
- APS State Liaison
How are counties tracking data?

- Four for-profit data systems
  - AACTS
  - Harmony
  - Jump Technology
  - Panoramic
- County built systems
- Excel spreadsheets
- Hand counts

None of these systems talk to the others!
Databases and Casework

What is the impact on the Client?
The Story of a Traveling High Utilizer
APS and the Criminal Justice System

The Full Story

Tracking Alleged Perpetrators
Data Collection and Evidence Based Practice

Current Practices Create Barriers to:

• Implementing evidence-based assessment tools
• Identifying unmet service needs
• Creating client profiles
• Tracking client outcomes
Our project...

• How the partnership happened
Planning process to be NAMRS ready

- Agency component data
  ✔
- Key component data
  ❌
- Case level data
  ❌
How this parallels what NAMRS is doing for the country?

- California would like to start with getting key indicators from counties
- California would also eventually want to move towards a statewide system to collect case level data
- One of the most important take-away message is that- California would like to be able to allow counties to compare data across county lines
Our initial question...

- What key element component data have we been collecting?
- Can we submit key component data to NAMRS?
Data Collection

- Southern Regional APS Committee’s survey
What we found...

- Lack of data collection
- Lack of consistency
Then we thought...

- So we are not doing a very good job collecting data. But why?
- Does this have anything to do with data systems used by county?
- Does this have anything to do with county size?
Data Collection

- UCSF data system survey
What we found...

- Small and big counties might have very different data practices
- Budget for data system varies
Ok, but we still had questions...

- How do we know if counties are willing to collect more data?
- Are we in favor of having a statewide system as a state?
- What are the specific challenges for big counties versus small counties?
Data Collection

- Key informant interview
Here are the initial findings...

- Counties’ attitudes towards a statewide database
- Counties’ thoughts about providing statewide data to NAMRS
- Innovative programs/practices
- Counties’ suggestions to SOC 242 revision
  - What should we collect in addition to client and perpetrator information?
Research to Practice Coalitions
Next steps
Advice from the audience