AGENDA

I. Welcome / Review
   1. Welcome (Jennifer Spoeri, NAPSA; Julie Murawski, NAPSA)
   2. The goals of AADI and this Forum (Kenny Steinman, Ohio State University)
   3. How does this work align with the Administration for Community Living’s priorities? (Stephanie Whittier Eliason, US Administration for Community Living)

II. How are we already using APS administrative data? (Joy Ernst, Wayne State University)
   1. Process for collecting/summarizing studies and reports.
   2. General conclusions
   3. Assigned breakout rooms to discuss noteworthy examples.
      a. Using APS administrative data for continuous quality improvement. Texas and Oklahoma have robust APS administrative data systems that monitor the quality of their work and evaluate innovative practices. Join APS quality experts and researchers to discuss how they use these systems for quality assurance and program evaluation. Panelists: Julie Shores, Texas Dept of Family and Protective Services; Reza Zeinalpour, Oklahoma APS; Farida Ejaz, Benjamin Rose Institute.
      b. Building enduring partnerships among APS professionals and researchers. Using administrative data often requires long-term relationships rooted in trust and mutual benefit. We will discuss how to build them using examples from Maine and San Francisco. Panelists: Erin Salvo, Maine APS; Akiles Ceron, San Francisco APS; David Burnes, University of Toronto; Marian Liu, Purdue University.
      c. Research with APS administrative data: Technical issues. Research with APS administrative data involves challenges that resemble those faced by researchers in other fields. Join two APS researchers, and an expert on using administrative data from education to discuss what APS can learn from other fields. Panelists: Jason Burnett, University of Texas Health Sciences Center; Zachary Gassoumis, University of Southern California; Andrew Penner, University of California, Irvine.

[reconvene / open Q&A]
III. **How could we better use administrative data to improve APS?**
(Mary Twomey, independent consultant; Zachary Gassoumis, University of Southern California)

1. Identifying important research questions that administrative data are well-positioned to help address.
2. Four priority questions

   a. What is the impact of caseload size on the quality of investigations and interventions?

   b. Does the determination of a successful outcome vary by adult maltreatment type or other factors, and if so how?

   c. What types/kinds of referral services (e.g., legal services, transportation services) are effective for each maltreatment type?

   d. What is the impact of using standardized tools on APS service delivery and client outcomes?

3. What kinds of questions are important to APS, yet administrative data cannot (currently) address?

4. Breakout rooms: Facilitated discussions with ≤10 participants, each focused on one of the research questions. Each group will consider: Why is this question important? How exactly could existing data help? What additional data are needed to answer the question?

   [reconvene / open Q&A]

5. Selected facilitators report back

IV. **Conclusion**

1. **Evaluation** (Heather Mutchie, Purdue University)

2. **Next steps** (Kenny Steinman, Ohio State University)

3. **Q&A and concluding remarks** (Marian Liu, Purdue University)

*Please contact info@napsa-now.org for more information*