

State Grants to Enhance APS

Logic Model: The Whole Picture

Stephanie Whittier Eliason and Elizabeth Petruy
Office of Elder Justice and Adult Protective Services

November 12, 2019

Objectives

- Understand why you've been asked to complete the logic model assignment
- Understand how ACL uses your logic model to tell the story of this grant portfolio

Session Agenda

- Rationale behind logic model assignment
- Review the APS Process Model
- Review the logic model assignment
- Discuss mapping your logic model to the process model
- Discuss how ACL uses this information

Why a Logic Model?

- Creating it forces you to think through your project from start to finish
- It can be used for evaluation and performance measurement
- It can be used to tell your project's story to key stakeholders, including your leadership and other potential partners
- We need it to tell the story of this grant portfolio

Your Assignment

1. Create a logic model of your project using the template provided by your project officer
2. Map your logic model to the APS Process Model using the mapping document

Example State Logic Model

Example State		
Project Period: Sep 2018 – Aug 2021		
Overall Goal: Improve outcomes for the individuals served by State's Adult Protective Services Program through enhanced assessment, monitoring of progress towards case plan goals, and improved data analysis.		
Objectives/Activities	Outputs	Anticipated Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement of a web based assessment and case management system Add missing components identified through the NAMRS project to assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expected products include model APS case management and data systems that accurately reflect the interventions needed to result in positive outcomes for persons served by State's APS Program. Increase data collection in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender – currently, a client is only able to report male or female; Sexual orientation Race - reporting categories are currently not reflective of State's diverse population; Ethnicity English Competency – LES gathered on assessment; "Language Barrier" is a data element; Primary Language – Follow-up question to LES on assessment, but not collected as data element; Marital Status – currently collected, but client is unable to report "domestic partner, including civil union"; Employment Status Client Benefits Veteran Status Physical and Mental disabilities - currently collected during assessment, but only included in data set if considered a "barrier"; Living Setting at Close Substitute Decision maker at Close Services at Close Interagency Coordination Specific to Perpetrator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cohabitation at Close Association at Close Substitute decision maker at Close Legal Remedy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A real time data system with additional elements will give the APS Program the opportunity to run reports, analyze data, and identify areas of concern that need to be monitored, which will improve both quality and efficiency, and result in a program that is more responsive to the individuals it serves through the program. APS service providers will demonstrate an increased ability to holistically assess the victim; Victims will actively participate in the development and progress towards case plan goals; Providers will increase knowledge of the perpetrator's relationship with the victim throughout the progression of the case; The program will be able to more fully measure its impact based on victim outcomes The program will reduce its percentage of subsequent reports.

Things to remember

- Reference the APS Process model and ask yourself which domains your project falls into
- Are you focusing on one particular section of the process model, or more than one?

THE APS PROCESS MODEL

Context	Inputs/Resources	Activities	Activity Metrics	Expected Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Older adults and adults with disabilities are subject to maltreatment—abuse, neglect and exploitation (ANE)—by others or through self-neglect. Allegations of ANE are reported to APS agencies by family members, professionals (e.g., bank or doctor) and the general public. Under state law, APS agencies, often in partnership with the community and experts, investigate ANE, provide protection from harm, and address causes of ANE, while respecting the values of person-centered/self-determined service planning and use of least restrictive appropriate setting for services. APS programs are usually part of an “aging” or social services/protective agency. Some are state-administered, and some are county-administered programs. 	<p>APS staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intake Investigative or service worker Supervisor Management <p>Consultative experts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical and mental health Forensic (accounting, investigation) Multi-disciplinary teams (MDT) Legal staff <p>Community partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aging network Protection and advocacy Law enforcement/DA Guardianship programs Non-profit agencies <p>Operational supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and procedures Case management, reporting, and accounting system(s) Hiring and training staff Standardized assessment tools Other technology supports Funding for services <p>Legal and ethical process to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect alleged victim’s rights Provide alleged perpetrator due process Institute program values 	<p>Obtain information from reporter Provide information, refer to other agency, or accept intake</p> <p>Initiate: prioritize risk, contact AV, assess emergency needs, and take emergency protective action (if needed)</p> <p>Assess AVs: disability status, decision-making capacity (non-legal and/or legal), formal and informal support systems, social and health needs, physical environment, and financial status.</p> <p>Interview: AV, AP, collaterals</p> <p>Collect physical evidence (medical, financial, etc.)</p> <p>Consult with supervisor and appropriate experts and teams</p> <p>Determine finding and communicate results</p> <p>Make service recommendation</p>	<p>Intake</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of reports (intakes) screened in # of reports (intakes) screened out/referred <p>Investigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of initial alleged victim contacts # of legal protective actions # of alleged victims receiving emergency services #/timeliness of investigations # of cases/investigator # of formal assessments #/timeliness of interviews # of referrals of alleged victim for assessment or services # of investigations by closure reason # of referrals of alleged perpetrators for legal remedy # of caregivers receiving services # of confirmed: allegations, perpetrators, cases Average length of time per investigation 	<p>Information to reporter Appropriate intakes Appropriate referrals</p> <p>AV is safe and no longer in state of ANE</p> <p>Risk from perpetrator addressed</p> <p>Referrals to other entities (e.g., regulatory programs, law enforcement)</p>
		<p>Obtain agreement and implement service plan</p> <p>Refer to community partners or purchase services</p> <p>Monitor status of victim and services</p>	<p>Post-Investigation Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of alleged victims accepting services, refusing services # of MDT referrals Amount of purchased services and community resources accessed # of referrals # of placements # of client contacts 	<p>AV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is safe Has reduced long-term risk for ANE
		<p>Document investigation/service Review/approve for closure Conduct QA process</p>	<p>Quality Assurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % cases documented timely # of supervisor approvals # of fatality reviews # of cases reviewed for QA 	<p>Quality of investigations and services is maintained or improved</p>

Example State Mapping

State APS Enhancement Grant Mapping to the APS Logic Model

Inputs/Resources	Intake	Investigation	Post- Investigation	Quality Assurance
<p>APS Staff Training/Education</p> <p>Community/Interagency Partnerships</p> <p>Consult Support</p> <p>Create New/Enhance Existing Operational Supports Example State</p> <p>Legal and ethical processes</p>	<p>Screening and Assessment Tools</p> <p>Case Planning Tools</p> <p>Create New/Enhance Existing Reporting Systems</p>	<p>Assessment</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Collecting Physical Evidence</p> <p>Consult Support</p> <p>Determinations and Service Recommendations</p>	<p>Obtaining client agreement and Implementing Service Plan</p> <p>Referring clients to community partners or Purchasing Services</p> <p>Monitor Status of Victim and Services</p>	<p>Documentation of investigation/services</p> <p>Expand Data Capacity Example State</p> <p>Customer Satisfaction</p> <p>Quality Assurance Review</p>

USING YOUR LOGIC MODEL

Overall Mapping of EJSG Grants to APS Logic Model

State APS Enhancement Grant Mapping to the APS Logic Model						
Inputs/Resources		Intake	Investigation	Post-Investigation	Quality Assurance	
APS Staff Training/Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New York (15) Pennsylvania (15) Washington (15) Idaho (16) Massachusetts (elderly) (16) Missouri (16) Arkansas (18) California (18) Idaho (18) Maine (18) Minnesota (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Oklahoma (18) Virginia (18) Rhode Island (18) 	Create New/Enhance Existing Operational Supports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alabama (15) Colorado (15) District of Columbia (15) Iowa (15) Illinois (15) New York (15) Oklahoma (15) Pennsylvania (15) Virginia (15) Washington (15) Arizona (16) California (16) Delaware (16) Hawaii (16) Idaho (16) Massachusetts (Elderly) (16) Maryland (16) Minnesota (16) Missouri (16) Montana (16) Nevada (16) Ohio (16) Arizona (18) Arkansas (18) California (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Oklahoma (18) Pennsylvania (18) Rhode Island (18) Virginia (18) 	Screening and Assessment Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado (15) Iowa (15) Arizona (16) Hawaii (16) Maryland (16) Montana (16) Arizona (18) Minnesota (18) Nevada (18) Rhode Island (18) Case Planning Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District of Columbia (15) Montana (16) Arkansas (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Nevada (18) Create New/Enhance Existing Reporting Systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arizona (18) Arkansas (18) Idaho (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Oklahoma (18) Pennsylvania (18) Virginia (18) Rhode Island (18) 	Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado (15) Iowa (15) Arizona (16) Massachusetts (Elderly) (16) Maryland (16) Montana (16) Arizona (18) Idaho (18) Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ohio (18) Collecting Physical Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Consult Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massachusetts (DPCC) (15) New York (15) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Ohio (18) Oklahoma (18) Rhode Island (18) Determinations and Service Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District of Columbia (15) Arizona (16) Hawaii (16) 	Obtaining client agreement and Implementing Service Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idaho (18) Maine (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Oklahoma (18) Pennsylvania (18) Referring clients to community partners or Purchasing Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arizona (18) Idaho (18) Maine (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18) Oklahoma (18) Pennsylvania (18) Monitor Status of Victim and Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massachusetts (DPCC) (15) Pennsylvania (15) Arizona (16) Maryland (16) Arizona (18) Maine (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Nevada (18) 	Documentation of investigation/services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arizona (18) Arkansas (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Nevada (18) Virginia (18) Expand Data Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alabama (15) Iowa (15) Illinois (15) Massachusetts (DPPC) (15) New York (15) Oklahoma (15) Pennsylvania (15) Virginia (15) Washington (15) California (16) Hawaii (16) Idaho (16) Massachusetts (Elderly) (16) Maryland (16) Minnesota (16) Missouri (16) Montana (16) Nevada (16) Ohio (16) Tennessee (16) Arizona (18) Arkansas (18) Idaho (18) Maine (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Minnesota (18) Montana (18) 	Customer Satisfaction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pennsylvania (15) Arizona (18) Idaho (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Minnesota (18) Quality Assurance Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Washington (15) Hawaii (16) Nevada (16) Arizona (18) Massachusetts DPPC (18) Minnesota (18) Montana (18) Nevada (18)

Funding Requests

- Previous state grantees' activities have focused on building the necessary inputs and resources to conduct the work of their APS state systems, including:
 - Developing and implementing training curricula for APS staff,
 - Building community partnerships,
 - Engaging consultative experts,
 - Creating new, or enhancing existing, operational supports such as electronic case management systems,
 - Creating and validating risk and safety assessment tools, and
 - Increasing the quality and quantity of data reported to NAMRS.

Concluding Thoughts

- Your logic model
 - Helps you talk about your project in simple terms
 - Serves as a tool to track your progress and measure your success
 - Gives you insight into what might be a next step or how you could further develop your program
- We need it to tell the story of this grant portfolio

Questions?

- Contact your project officer or
- Contact the APS TARC at apstarc-ta@acl.hhs.gov

Thank You!