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Why DR for APS?
Why now?

- Aging population with adults 65+ expected to double from 46 million today to over 98 million in 2060.

- In Colorado 22% of cases are closed as "Adult Refuses Services" and another 22% are closed as "Allegations Unsubstantiated". A non-investigative response coupled with the strengths based approach of DR services could increase engagement.

- Adult at risk of maltreatment and their caregivers deserve a response tailored to their specific circumstance, assuring the least restrictive intervention determined through a rigorous assessment.

- In circumstances of minor or moderate allegations of abuse, adults, families and caregivers can be given the opportunity for supports and services rather than being subjected to an adversarial investigative process.

- Implementation of the Differential Response Model supports Adult Protective Services to uphold the core values of consent, confidentiality, self-determination and least restrictive involvement and within that is commitment to improving safety and advocating for justice for our most vulnerable residents.
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And, growing...

GOT COLLABORATION?

Collaboration divides the task and multiplies the success.
What is Differential Response?

- Two-track model which allows for a customized response to adults and families based on the severity of the abuse/neglect allegations
  - Family Assessment Response (FAR) or Alternative Response (AR)
    - Low to moderate allegations of abuse/neglect
    - Non-investigative
    - No findings
  - High Risk Assessment (HRA) or Investigative Response (IR)
    - High risk allegations of abuse/neglect
    - Investigation and fact finding
    - Substantiation decisions
What is Differential Response? (cont.)

- Emphasizes the importance of broadly assessing situations to identify and meet underlying needs from the very beginning through an Enhanced Screening process.
- Applies to reports that do not allege serious or imminent harm – low to moderate risk.
- Group decision making through a RED Team or Group Supervision Framework to identify strengths and current protective factors as well as worries and opportunities.
- Allows for valuable discussion to occur and shares the load in determining if a referral meets criteria for assignment and for case direction and support when needed.
- Sets aside investigation, fault finding, and substantiation decisions and seeks to achieve safety through engagement and collaborative partnerships.
- Uses reflective solution focused questions from the very beginning and throughout the life of a case so that facilitation of behavioral change needed to provide long term safety can begin.
Why Differential Response?

- Allows for more than one method of initial response to reports of abuse and neglect – current practice assumes a “one size fits all”
- Circumstances and needs of our vulnerable adult population differ and so should the response
- Family and community engagement helps to assure safety for our adults at risk of maltreatment
- Upholds our core values of consent, confidentiality, self-determination, and least restrictive involvement
- Non-investigative and strengths based approach may reduce the number of at risk adults who refuse service
  - Increase in cases closed with “APS Intervention Complete”
  - Decrease rate of repeat involvement
Why Differential Response? (cont.)

- Allows the practice of calling ahead to notify a referral was made to the Department and assigned and work together to schedule a home visit
- Does not require interviewing the victim outside the presence of the alleged perpetrator
  - Increases engagement of adult and family members
  - Lessens the strain on adult and family members
- Does not require making findings on low to moderate risk allegations (self-neglect)
- Focus of partnership with the family and support network to safely care for the adult
- Increases potential for client and family to reach out in the future for support
- Allows the ability to track change if deemed appropriate when new information obtained
- Both AAR and IR tracks utilize a rigorous assessment of safety, risk and protective factors, as well as strengths and needs of families
Proposed Model for DR in Adult Protection

Dual Track Response System
- Alternative Response
- Investigative Response

Optional Practices to Support Differential Response
- Support Planning
- Facilitated Family Meetings
APS DR Model
Process Map
Enhanced Screening

- From initial call, reporting party is asked for information in an organized, strength-based approach; occasionally including a scaling question
  - What concerns do you want to report?
  - What prompted you to call today?
    - Identify what possible supports may have been in place previously that mitigated reporting party’s concerns. What has changed?
  - What interventions have been tried?
    - Also helps to identify other resources or agencies that are or have been involved
  - What would be helpful/improve situation?
    - RP is then used as an “expert” on what they feel will help; guides APS on what expectation there might be
  - On a scale of 1-10; 10 being the “most safe” and 1 being “extremely unsafe”
    - RP is asked to scale the safety numerically. By engaging the non-emotional side of the brain a more objective assessment of situation is obtained
## APS DR Model

### Track Assignment Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neglect</th>
<th>Investigative Response</th>
<th>Alternative Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional/facility/paid caretaker</td>
<td>Self-neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic neglect/lack of supervision by non-professional</td>
<td>Client found wandering from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to provide medical care resulting in serious medical consequences</td>
<td>Client has minor bruise or injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile/fearful environment</td>
<td>Condition of home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Investigative Response</th>
<th>Alternative Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional/facility/paid caretaker</td>
<td>Pain with no injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-accidental severe injury</td>
<td>Accidental injury (minor bruising, skin tears, sores, broken bone, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life-threatening injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unreasonable confinement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive/pattern of physical injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Abuse</th>
<th>Investigative Response</th>
<th>Alternative Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always Investigative Response</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Investigative Response</th>
<th>Alternative Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional/facility/paid caretaker</td>
<td>Minor poor money management, misunderstanding of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorized financial change with adverse effect</td>
<td>Exploitation with an unnamed perpetrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RED Team Framework

## Team Members
- First and Last name of staff involved in RED Team process

## Danger/Harm
- Enter the date report called in, RP and what mistreatment is being reported.
- Outline specific alterations including a summary of the concern reported.
- *Note any safety concerns (guns in home, suicidal, etc.)*

## Complicating Risks & Vulnerabilities
- Include evidence of what makes client at risk (e.g. diagnosis, age, observable medical needs, help with medications, IADL’s and ADL’s, etc.)
- *The majority of the summary belongs in this area*

## Current Strengths & Supports
- Identify services already in place
- List supports provided from family or neighbors or professionals

## Client & Alleged Perpetrator History
- Review CAPS, CBMS, CO Courts, Denver Courts; other data systems (TRAILS, Property Search, etc.)
- Prior referrals include # of prior referrals, outcomes of referrals (screened in or out and outcome of investigation) and any patterns of mistreatment

## Gray Area
- Identify what is an opinion or subjective information in the report.
- Identify any gaps or information that doesn’t make sense.
- Does the report state information that has no basis (e.g. mention of dementia but no formal diagnosis, etc.)

## Cultural Considerations
- Ethnicity
- Language / need for interpreter services
- Other cultural or background information that could be relevant (e.g. former military, immigrants, etc.)

## Disposition/Next Steps
- Heart of the RED Team discussion belongs in this section. Include how the team came to final decision
- Include whether client is an at-risk adult. If client is not an at-risk adult, screen out.
- If client is an at-risk adult, team must determine if a mistreatment occurred. If no mistreatment occurred, screen out.
- If mistreatment occurred, screen in, assign a response time.
Group Supervision

What?
- A Group Consultation with a defined purpose and desired outcome
- Uses the Framework to help organize information

How?
- Typically facilitated by a supervisor
- Format is flexible to meet each team’s needs
  - Example: 30 minutes discussion between supervisor and caseworker. 15 minutes of questions and ideas from the group. 15 minutes for wrap-up

Why?
- Provides a balanced picture of what is going on in the case (what’s going well and what we are worried about)
- Helps to determine next steps
- Focused on information vs. feelings about the case
- Is a parallel process for how we might ask questions of clients and families (solution focused engagement skills)

When?
- At any point in the life of a case – findings, next steps, whether or not to close or not, file for guardianship, medical decisions, etc.
## Group Supervision Framework

### Client/Purpose of Group Supervision
- First and Last name Client
  - Age of Client
- Purpose of consult: i.e. next steps, timeframe of involvement, findings etc.

### Reason for Referral & Danger/Harm
- Enter the date report called in, RP and brief summary of initial concerns called, i.e. mistreatment
- Note any ongoing safety concerns (guns in home, suicidal, etc.)

### Complicating Risks & Vulnerabilities
- Information about what makes client at risk (e.g. diagnosis, age, observable medical needs, help with medications, IADL’s and ADL’s, etc.)
- Include what concerns continue to exist since APS involvement (cancelling home health services, refusing transport by EMS)

### Strengths and Supports
- Identify services in place, both at time of referral and since APS intervention
- List supports provided from family or neighbors or professionals
- Include information about income/insurance/other benefits or subsidies, if known

### Gray Area
- Identify areas that are still unknown, due to client being unwilling/unable to share and/or caseworker is not able to confirm with other supports
- Identify any gaps in information

### Disposition/Next Steps
- Heart of the discussion belongs in this section.
- Listing out next steps, including who is responsible for what actions
- If supports are to be contacted, what do we want to know: listing out specific questions
- If consult purpose was findings, include what finding decision was the consensus, including severity level is necessary
Solution Focused Engagement Skills

- Why do we do this work? The million dollar question
- What does Engagement mean to you?
- Why Solution Focused?
  - Focuses on Solutions vs. the problem
  - Assumes the client/family is the expert on the situation
  - Helps create a partnership vs. a power struggle
  - A Question can be an intervention
Solution Focused Engagement Skills, cont.

- Examples of Solution Focused Questions:
  - Exception Questions
  - Scaling Questions
  - Coping Questions
  - Preferred Future Questions
  - Relationship Questions
Next Steps

- What would it take to implement Differential Response?
  - What are the pro’s and con’s of a pilot versus legislative steps?
- Continue to engage with counties across Colorado to further discuss the APS practice model
- Work to engage with State APS staff to partner on a DR model for Colorado
- Continue to explore other models and practices in other locations throughout the United States.
  - Would other States be interested in a DR model?
  - What are other States doing?
Christen Mason: cmason@arapahoegov.com
Lori Metz: metzl@co.larimer.co.us