Comparison of APS Program ARPA Operational Plans

State Spending by Category*



38% Program



Includes spending at **department discretion** (9%), and on process improvement (5%), operational plan (5%), data collection and reporting (4%) and quality assurance (3%)

32% Staff

Includes spending on hiring/contracting (14%), training (13%), retention (4%), and equipment (2%)



5% Client

Includes spending on **wrap around services** (9%), case aids (4%) and shelter (1%)



15% Community

Includes spending on **partnership** (7%), awareness (5%), community partner training (1%), outreach (1%) and tribal nations (1%)



^{1%} Policy

Includes spending on regulations





IDENTIFIED WEAKNESSES

from APS environmental scans

Staff Hiring

Lack of:

- Efficient hiring processes
- Qualified social workers
- Program support positions
- Workforce diversity



Staff Retention

Impacted by:

- · High caseloads
- Non-competitive salaries
- Lack of advancement opportunities

Staff Training

Lack of:

- Consistent funding for training
- Standardized training requirements
- Dedicated trainers
- Funding to support SW degrees



Community Partners

Issues include:

- · Lack of collaboration
- Limited availability of professional evaluations
- Need for clear communication

Public Awareness

Lack of visibility and understanding of:

- Who qualifies as a client
- · What are realistic outcomes
- Impact of limited resources
- Limits placed by client's self determination



Community Partners' Training

Partners need:

- · Mandated reporter training
- Understanding of APS policy
- Education on signs of abuse

Community Resources

Services not keeping pace with needs:

- Lack of state funding for resources
- Rural areas esp. have limited resources
- · Geropsychiatric services needed





Policy Funding

Lack of consistent and appropriate local, state and federal funding

Analysis of Operational Plans

for Use of ARPA Funding by APS

Focus of plan spending by region*

Northeast I



Program=34% Staffing=28%

Northeast II



Program=57% Client=18% Staff=18%

Southeast



Program=35% Client=26%

Southwest



West I



Program=50% Staff=32%

West II



Staff=40% Community= 19% Client=19%

Central



Program=42% Staffing=37%

Mountain



Program=29% Staffing=27%

Territories



Staff=36% Community=27%

Future Funding Recommendations



Make funding available for more APS investigators to reduce caseloads and increase services



Provide funding to allow for program innovations beyond basic program needs



Invest in more
public awareness
efforts to
increase the
public's
understanding of
APS' role



Funding federal, state and local policy changes