

# **REPORT ON**

## **STATE ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES**

### **TRAINING PROGRAMS**

This Report was prepared for the National Center on Elder Abuse  
by Joanne Otto, Executive Director,  
Susan Castano, Rutgers University and Kevin W. Marlatt, consultants  
on behalf the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators  
a partner of the National Center on Elder Abuse  
The Report was supported by a grant No. 90-AP-2144  
from the Administration on Aging  
Department of Health and Human Services.  
Grantees undertaking projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to  
express freely their findings and conclusions.  
Therefore, points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official  
Administration on Aging Policy

## THE NATIONAL CENTER ON ELDER ABUSE

The National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) is administered by the National Association of State Units on Aging as the lead agency and funded by grant No. 90-AP-2144 from the U.S. Administration on Aging. NCEA consists of a consortium of six partner organizations.

NCEA exists to provide elder abuse information to professionals and the public; offer technical assistance and training to elder abuse agencies and related professionals; conduct short-term elder abuse research; and assist with elder abuse program and policy development. NCEA's website and clearinghouse contain many resources and publications to help achieve these goals.

### PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

**Sara Aravanis**, Director  
**Carol Downs**, Elder Rights Specialist  
National Center on Elder Abuse  
National Association State Units  
on Aging  
1201 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 350  
Washington, DC 20005-2800  
(202) 898-2586 / Fax: (202) 898-2583  
[NCEA@nasua.org](mailto:NCEA@nasua.org)

**Mary Twomey**, Director  
Elder Abuse Prevention Program  
Goldman Institute on Aging  
3330 Geary Blvd.  
San Francisco, CA 94118  
(415) 750-4180 / Fax: (415) 750-4136  
[mtwomey@gioa.org](mailto:mtwomey@gioa.org)

**Eva Kutas**, President  
National Association of Adult Protective  
Services Administrators  
Mental Health & Developmental  
Disabilities Services Division  
P.O. Box 14250  
2575 Bittern Street, NE  
Salem, OR 97309-0740  
(503) 945-9491 / Fax: (503) 378-3796  
[eva.kutas@state.or.us](mailto:eva.kutas@state.or.us)

**Karen Stein**, Director  
Clearinghouse on Abuse and  
Neglect of the Elderly (CANE)  
Department of Consumer Studies  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716  
(302) 831-3525 / Fax: (302) 831-6081  
[kstein@udel.edu](mailto:kstein@udel.edu)

**Lori Stiegel**, Associate Staff Director  
Commission on Legal Problems  
of the Elderly  
American Bar Association  
740 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-1022  
(202) 662-8692 / Fax: (202) 662-8698  
[lstiegel@staff.abanet.org](mailto:lstiegel@staff.abanet.org)

**Bob Blancato**, President  
National Committee for the  
Prevention of Elder Abuse  
c/o Matz, Blancato & Associates  
1101 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1001  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 789-0470 / Fax: (202) 682-3984  
[msbrb@erols.com](mailto:msbrb@erols.com)

#### National Center on Elder Abuse

1201 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 350 - Washington, DC .- 20005-2800  
(202) 898-2586 – Fax: (202) 898-2583 – [NCEA@nasua.org](mailto:NCEA@nasua.org) –  
[www.elderabusecenter.org](http://www.elderabusecenter.org)

**SUMMARY**  
**Survey of State Adult Protective Services**  
**Training Programs**

**March 2002**

**Methods**

In 2000, as part of its charge to conduct short-term research activities, the National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) identified a need for baseline information on various aspects of state APS programs. NCEA identified one of its partner organizations, the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators (NAAPSA), as the logical entity to carry out a Baseline Study of States' APS Programs. In August 2001, NAAPSA sent letters and five-page survey forms to APS Administrators in all 50 states, the territories and the District of Columbia. Thirty-six states and one territory responded.

**Findings**

Only 19 of the 36 responding states had specific annual APS training budgets which were funded equally by state and Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) funds. A small amount of Older Americans Act money was also used. The remaining states had no specific annual APS training budgets, although two creative states mentioned using APS conference registration fees or earmarked casino profits to support their training efforts.

Most of the states' training programs included goals and objectives, participant evaluations, pre and post tests, APS job competencies and worker certification. Educational requirements for line staff and supervisors were usually a bachelor's degree. Training was usually provided by state APS staff.

State laws and regulations and basic investigation and interviewing techniques were the competencies most often required for new APS staff. The majority of the states said that training was required for new workers. The average number of hours of required training for new workers was 68, 18.9 hours for experienced workers, and 28 hours for supervisors. Two-thirds of the states indicated that new workers were allowed or expected to work in the field before completing their basic training.

Thirty five-responders reported that they held cross training with a wide variety of other professionals. The groups they were most likely to cross train with were law enforcement (91.4%), health care providers (80%), and aging network professionals (80%).

States indicated that their primary unmet training needs included resource development; working with difficult people; working with culturally diverse populations; worker self awareness and working with people with mental illness and with perpetrators.

Almost all of the states responded that lack of specific funding for APS training was their greatest obstacle. Many states said that they had no staff training specialists at the state level. They also listed in and out-of-state travel restrictions as serious obstacles. Most states indicated that local staff welcomed training. "Staff has been crying for training," one state said.

The majority of the states indicated that they will continue to offer basic APS training at annual statewide conferences. A few also mentioned conducting training needs

assessments, developing specialized curricula, using teleconferences and exploring the possibility of computer based training.

### **Discussion**

Almost half the states responding to this survey have no annual identified APS training budgets. It is likely that some of the fourteen states that did not complete this survey also lack training funds. This lack of consistent identified funding makes it very difficult for states to plan training from one year to the next. For those states that do have training allocations, an annual average budget of \$120,405 seems low, given the vulnerability of the victims, and the complexity of responses required to reduce their risk of abuse, exploitation and neglect. Although Elder Abuse Prevention Funds are available under the Older Americans Act, and can be used to provide training to APS and other professionals, only 6% of the reported funds came from this source. Almost half of the states' training money came from SSBG funds which have been steadily reduced in recent years.

While most states reported using their own staff for training, many states do not have training specialists with expertise in adult learning techniques. Thus, in addition to their other duties, state staff may be called upon to develop training curricula on a wide variety of highly specialized subjects. A recent sample of APS cases collected by NAAPSA shows that these cases are often very complex. Victims suffered from a variety of physical ailments, mental problems, and often multiple types of abuse. Based on this sample of cases, the training provided to workers who deal with complex cases of elder/disabled adult abuse on a daily basis may not be sufficient.

### **Policy Implications**

The current focus on mandatory reporting and outcome measurement overlooks the APS workers who take the reports and provide the services that result in outcomes measured. Further study is needed to determine the effect of training on casework outcomes. This study indicates that often these workers receive limited training on state laws and regulations and some basic interviewing skills. This means that some workers may lack the tools they need to respond effectively to complex cases.

Comprehensive training is needed for new and experienced APS workers as well as their supervisors. Since the recent downturn in the economy in this country, many states have made drastic budget reductions to protect dwindling state funds. One of the first targets of such reductions is training programs. Anecdotal information from many states in the last few months indicates that there have been dramatic cuts in travel funds which limit APS staff participation in training opportunities at the local, state and national level.

Dedicated annual federal funding for training Adult Protective Services staff nationwide would be one approach to solving this problem. A NAAPSA survey of state APS programs in 1995 showed that most states strongly supported earmarked federal funding for this purpose. Child Welfare services have had special funding for training under Title IV E for many years. This funding has helped states to develop state of the art, comprehensive training programs for all levels of child welfare workers and supervisors. More information is needed on which federal funds might be used specifically to provide training to APS staff. Given the rapidly expanding growth of the 60+ population as well as the increasing life spans of adults with disabilities who, in the past, would not have survived into middle and old age, a national response to Adult Protective Services training needs is called for.

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ADULT PROTECTIVE  
SERVICES ADMINISTRATORS**

**REPORT ON STATES ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES  
TRAINING PROGRAMS**

**March 2002**

**INTRODUCTION**

Recent studies indicate that as many as one half million vulnerable older persons and persons with disabilities may be subjected to abuse, neglect and financial exploitation annually. Many experts believe that this figure represents only the "tip of the iceberg," suggesting that for every reported incident of elder abuse, exploitation, neglect or self-neglect, approximately five more go unreported.<sup>1</sup>

Over the next twenty-five years, the number of Americans over the age of 65 will virtually double. The growth of this population is likely to significantly increase the number of potential abuse victims. The principal public source of response to reports and cases of vulnerable adult abuse, neglect and exploitation is Adult Protective Services (APS), which are empowered by states and local communities to accept and investigate reports of abuse, neglect and financial exploitation of the elderly and younger people with disabilities.

Adult Protective Services workers are frequently called upon to make critical decisions in complex situations. Many cases involve life and death medical problems which require familiarity with a wide range of diseases and disabling conditions, the uses of commonly prescribed medications and their interactions, appropriate medical and nursing procedures and treatments as well as how to recognize potential medical emergencies. Workers need to be aware of public health hazards and how to protect themselves from exposure to infectious diseases. Other situations may involve complicated financial matters, mental health concerns, problems of substance abuse, domestic violence and family dysfunction. In addition, workers need to be familiar with the social services delivery systems at the local, state and national levels in order to get the most appropriate services for their clients.

APS workers also must have an understanding of complex legal issues including questions of capacity; undue influence; guardianship; powers of attorney and the rights of the victim to self determination vs. the duty of the state to protect its most helpless citizens. In addition, perpetrator registries in some states raise issues about civil rights and possible litigation.

---

<sup>1</sup> *National Elder Abuse Incidence Study*, American Public Human Services Association, Washington, D.C. 1998.

In 2000, as part of its charge to conduct short-term research activities, the National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) identified a need for baseline information on various aspects of state APS programs. NCEA identified one of its partner organizations, the National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators (NAAPSA), as the logical entity to carry out a Baseline Study of States' APS Programs. NAAPSA is an organization made up of state and local APS administrators. Founded in 1989, the mission of NAAPSA is to improve the quality and availability of services for disabled adults and elderly persons who are abused, neglected or exploited. With representatives in every state, NAAPSA was the organization most suited to collect this information nationwide.

The extent to which APS practitioners are trained will largely determine how well they are able to serve the target population. Since training is such an essential aspect of service delivery, it was identified as one of the first areas to be studied. Rutgers University School of Social Work has been a leader in the field of APS training since the late 1980's. In order to benefit from that expertise in conducting this study, NAAPSA partnered with NAAPSA member Susan Castano, APS trainer and consultant with Rutgers University. The purpose of this report is to provide information gained from this section of the Baseline Study.

## **METHODOLOGY**

In August 2001, a letter and five-page survey form were sent to all state APS administrators. The letter explained the process of the Baseline Study, and asked administrators to provide information on their APS training programs. In September, follow-up calls were made to non-respondents, urging them to complete the forms. As of November 1, 2001, 36 of the 50 states (72%) and one territory had provided their responses. Information from the forms was entered onto Excel spreadsheets, and then converted into a report.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Funding**

Of the 36 respondents to this question, 19 states (52.8%) indicated that they had specified annual APS training budgets. The amounts ranged from a high of \$600,000 (New York) to a low of \$1,440 for Minnesota. The total amount for all respondents was \$2,287,687. The average annual APS training allocation for the 19 respondents who reported having actual allocations was \$120,405. Sources of funding included state funds \$1,029,913 (45%), the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) \$1,041,000 (46%), the Older Americans Act \$132,942 (6%), local funds \$3,832 (1%) and other \$32,000 (2%). Missouri and Oregon reported using Medicaid funds for this purpose, but did not give dollar amounts. No states reported using TANF money for APS training.

Seventeen states (47%) said that they had no specific APS training allocation. Included in this number is Florida, which has a large elderly population, but said that they have no separate APS training funds, although they do use SSBG and state funds to pay for 15 statewide training positions. Two states found other creative sources of funding. They were Wisconsin, which reported generating \$25,000 in revenue from APS conference fees, and New Jersey, which reported receiving \$75,000 in state funds from casino profits which is used to contract with Rutgers University for organized training. And Oregon commented that they were requesting \$100,00 to \$150,000 for training. If these additional 17 states with \$0 training allocations are added to those states reporting having training money, the average annual state APS training allocation for 36 states and one territory comes to \$63,547.

### **Training Components**

States reported that their training components included training goals and objectives, participant evaluations, pre-and post-tests, APS job competencies and worker certification. Two states said that they had no formal training programs and one state indicated that their training program was in the development phase.

### **Staff Educational Requirements**

Educational requirements for line staff (workers who take reports, conduct investigations and provide and monitor services) were usually a bachelor's degree (85.7%) or high school graduation (17.1%). A few states required professional certification or licensure, a master's degree or an associate's degree.

Educational requirements for APS supervisors were most often a bachelor's degree (74.3%) or masters degree (14.3%), followed by, high school graduation, professional certification and associate degrees.

APS training was most likely to be provided by state APS staff (86.8%). On-the-job training was very common, as was the use of independent contractors. Other professionals, local APS staff and a few colleges and universities also provided some training as well.

Thirty states (78.9%) reported that training was required for all new workers by various combinations of administrative decision (76.6%), regulations (16.6%) or law (15.3%). The average number of hours per state of required training for new workers was 68—or 6.8 days. Out of 35 responses, two thirds of the states indicated that new workers are allowed or expected to work in the field before completing their basic training.

### **Basic Competencies for New Workers**

State laws and regulations, and basic investigation and interviewing techniques were the competencies most often required for new APS staff. Five states reported that they had no required competencies for new workers. Topic areas most likely to be included in new worker training included APS state laws, regulations and policies; financial exploitation; physical and sexual abuse; self neglect; community investigation techniques and neglect by caregivers.

### **Training for Experienced Workers**

Twenty states required ongoing training for experienced APS workers, while 18 states had no ongoing training requirements for them. Experienced APS workers were most likely to receive training on state APS laws, regulations and policies; financial exploitation; physical abuse; community based investigation techniques; state criminal codes; working with difficult people; interagency relationships/ coalition building and collecting evidence of financial exploitation. The average number of hours per state of required training for experienced workers was 18.9 hours.

### **Training for Supervisors**

Out of 38 respondents, 20 states (52.6%) required training for supervisors. The average number of hours per state of required training was 28. Supervisors usually were trained on dealing with personnel issues, teambuilding, conflict resolution and leadership.

### **Annual Statewide Training Conferences**

Out of 35 reporters, twenty-four reported having state wide annual conferences to provide basic or enhancement training to staff.

### **Cross-Training with Other Professionals**

Thirty-five responders (95%) reported that they held cross-training with a wide variety of other professionals. The groups with which they were most likely to cross-train were law enforcement (91.4%), health care providers (80%), and aging network professionals (80%).

### **Significant Training Needs**

States indicated that the training they needed but had not been able to provide included resource development; working with difficult people; working with



culturally diverse populations; worker self-awareness; working with people with mental illness and working with perpetrators.

### **Obstacles in Providing APS Training to Staff**

Almost all of the states responded that lack of specific funding for APS training was their greatest obstacle. Many states said that they had no staff training specialists. They also listed in and out-of-state travel restrictions as serious obstacles.

States said that they had repeatedly asked for additional funding for APS training but had met with little or no success. Fourteen states did not reply to this question. One state indicated that the original training budget had been set by the state legislature in 1992 and has not been increased since that time.

### **Resistance by Local APS Staff to Training Opportunities**

When asked what obstacles they encountered in training local staff, most states indicated that local staff welcomed training. "Staff has been crying for training," one state said. Occasionally more experienced staff were resistant to training, claiming that they already knew all they needed to know. State staff were most successful in overcoming this resistance by bringing the training onsite to the local level. While there was some reliance on administrative authority to force attendance, this was seen as usually ineffective.

### **Plans for Future Training**

The majority of the states (32) responded that they will continue to offer basic APS training at annual state-wide conferences. Some also mentioned conducting training needs assessments, developing specialized curricula, using teleconferences and exploring the possibility of computer based training. Four states—Missouri, New Hampshire, Oregon and Pennsylvania—talked about conducting statewide training assessments in order to develop competencies and certification programs that would occur on a regular basis.

## **DISCUSSION**

Almost half the states responding to this survey have no annual identified APS training budgets. It is likely that some of the fourteen states that did not complete this survey also lack training funds. This lack of consistent identified funding makes it very difficult for states to plan training from one year to the next. For those states that do have training allocations, an annual average budget of \$120,405 seems low, given the vulnerability of the victims, and the complexity of responses required to reduce their risk of abuse, exploitation and neglect. As a comparison, it would be helpful to have information on how much money is earmarked for Child Welfare worker training. Although Elder Abuse Prevention

Funds are available under the Older Americans Act, and can be used to provide training to APS and other professionals, only 6% of the state respondents' APS training allocations came from this source. Almost half of the states' training funds came from SSBG monies which have been reduced steadily over recent years.

While most states reported using their own staff for training, many states do not have training specialists with expertise in adult learning techniques. Thus, in addition to their other duties, state staff are called upon to develop training curricula even though they may lack expertise on curriculum development and adult learning skills. They also may be called upon to act as trainers on a wide variety of highly specialized subjects such as indicators of physical and/or mental illness and complex drug interactions. Only 26% of the states reported using colleges or universities to help with their training programs.

Given the complexity of the cases, the training components and subject matter most commonly provided by most states appear to be limited and sporadic, and staff and supervisory educational requirements minimal. While the majority of the states require training for new workers, two-thirds of the states that responded to this survey allow new workers into the field before they have completed their training. This means that some inexperienced workers are independently evaluating clients for immediate risk without the training required to make such determinations. Victims may suffer additional harm or even die as a result of this lack of knowledge. This raises issues of civil and criminal liability for employers and the state and local government agencies that oversee these programs.

While states listed a wide variety of unmet training needs, as well as a real hunger for information on the part of line staff, most respondents said that they would not be looking at conducting comprehensive statewide training assessments, but instead will continue to provide the same level and kind of training that they have in the past.

The field of adult protective services has grown increasingly complex over the past decade. Training by NAAPSA for state administrators at the national level has demonstrated the rapidly expanding body of knowledge pertinent to adult protection. Some of the topics include:

- Implications of aging and disease
- Interactions of various drug therapies
- Causes of self-neglect and hoarding behaviors
- Dynamics of abuse in later life
- Psychology of perpetrators
- Documentation required to build a credible case for prosecution

Many APS workers have not had the opportunity to benefit from this information. At most, they receive limited training on state laws and regulations and basic

interviewing skills. APS workers who are poorly trained cannot do their jobs effectively. The experience of Child Welfare agencies has shown that, even with extensive training, mistakes in assessing risk do occur. Some APS workers do not receive basic training on risk assessment. APS agencies and programs that do not provide comprehensive training for their staff are increasingly vulnerable to civil and criminal litigation. While litigation in Child Welfare has resulted in some consent decrees mandating increased funding for those programs, it is a poor substitute for a responsible, proactive approach to the ever-growing problem of abuse of elderly and disabled adults. It means that many additional victims must suffer harm before a remedy is sought.

A recent sample of APS cases collected by NAAPSA from just five states shows that these cases are often very complex. Victims suffered from a variety of physical ailments including:

- Infections
- Decubitus ulcers
- Malnutrition
- Anemia
- Renal insufficiency
- Cerebral palsy
- Hip fractures
- Weight loss
- Stroke
- Paraplegia.

Their mental problems included:

- Hallucinations
- Substance abuse
- Depression
- Developmental disabilities
- Chronic mental illness.

The types of abuse included:

- Physical abuse (burns and fractures)
- Psychological abuse
- Sexual abuse
- Financial exploitation by family members
- Misuse of living trusts, annuities, Powers of Attorney and credit cards
- Neglect by caregivers resulting in life threatening physical conditions
- Self-neglect resulting in unsafe living situations, utility shut-offs and evictions

In addition, there were ongoing legal issues that called for close collaboration between law enforcement and local, state and federal prosecutors. Most of these cases involved multiple physical and mental disabilities and more than one type of abuse, exploitation or neglect.

In order to respond appropriately to cases such as these, workers need to have training in many areas. They also need decision making and documentation skills. Based on this sample of cases, the training provided to workers who deal with complex cases of elder/disabled adult abuse on a daily basis may not be sufficient.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY**

Over the years, the subject of mandatory reporting of elder abuse has been raised repeatedly. More recently, attention has turned to measuring outcomes of Adult Protective Services. Both of these discussions have overlooked the APS workers who take the reports and provide the services that result in outcomes measured. From the information gained in this survey, it appears that many APS workers in at least 36 states and one territory may lack the tools they need to respond effectively to reports of abuse to vulnerable adults. More information is needed on the relationship between the level of training APS caseworkers receive and casework outcomes.

Comprehensive training is needed for new and experienced APS workers as well as their supervisors. Since the recent downturn in the economy in this country, many states have made drastic budget reductions to protect dwindling state funds. One of the first targets of such reductions is training programs. Anecdotal information from many states in the last few months indicates that there have been dramatic cuts in travel funds that limit APS staff participation in training opportunities at the local, state and national level.

Dedicated annual federal funding for training Adult Protective Services staff nationwide would be one approach to solving this problem. A NAAPSA survey of state APS programs in 1995 showed that most states strongly supported earmarked federal funding for this purpose. Child Welfare services have had special funding for training under Title IV E for many years. This funding has helped states to develop state-of-the-art, comprehensive training programs for all levels of child welfare workers and supervisors. More information is needed on which federal funds might be used specifically to provide training to APS staff.

Given the rapidly expanding growth of the 60+ population in America, as well as the increasing life spans of adults with disabilities who, in the past, would not have survived into middle and old age, a national response to Adult Protective Services staff training needs is called for.



Table of Contents

<b>A. 1.</b>	<b>Do you have an annual APS training budget?</b>	<b>1</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	1
<b>A. 2.</b>	<b>Information not available – APS funds not a separate line item</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A. 3.</b>	<b>If yes (Q. A.1.), what was your most recent annual training allocation?</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State By State Comparison	2
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State By State Rankings	2
<b>A. 4.</b>	<b>What are the sources and annual amounts of funding for your APS training program?</b>	<b>2-4</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State By State Funding Sources , Amounts and Notes	3-4
<b>B.</b>	<b>Does your state APS training include:</b>	<b>4-5</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	5
<b>C.</b>	<b>What are the educational requirements for your APS staff and supervisors?</b>	<b>5-7</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	7
<b>D.</b>	<b>Who provides training for APS staff in your state?</b>	<b>7-9</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	8
<b>E.</b>	<b>Training for newly trained APS workers in your state.</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>E. 1.</b>	<b>Is training required for new APS staff?</b>	<b>9</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	9
<b>E. 2.</b>	<b>If yes, how is training mandated in your state?</b>	<b>9-10</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	10
<b>E. 3.</b>	<b>If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for new APS staff?</b>	<b>10-12</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Tables	10-11
<b>E. 4.</b>	<b>What basic core competencies are required for new APS staff?</b>	<b>11-14</b>
<b>E. 5.</b>	<b>Are newly hired APS staff allowed in the field before completing basic training?</b>	<b>14-15</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	15
<b>F.</b>	<b>Training for experienced APS workers in your state.</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>F.1.</b>	<b>Is ongoing training required for experienced APS staff?</b>	<b>15</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	15
<b>F. 2.</b>	<b>If yes, how is training mandated in your state?</b>	<b>15-16</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	16
<b>F. 3.</b>	<b>If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for experienced APS staff?</b>	<b>16-18</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	17=18
<b>F. 4.</b>	<b>What basic core competencies are required for experienced APS workers?</b>	<b>18- 19</b>
<b>G.1.</b>	<b>Is ongoing training required for APS Supervisors?</b>	<b>19</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	19
<b>G. 2.</b>	<b>If yes, how is training mandated in your state?</b>	<b>19-20</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	20



**Table Of Contents**

<b>G. 3.</b>	<b>If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for APS Supervisors?</b>	<b>20-21</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Tables	20-21
<b>G. 4.</b>	<b>What basic core competencies are required for APS supervisors?</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>H.</b>	<b>How frequently must staff have additional training?</b>	<b>23-24</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	24
<b>I.</b>	<b>What is the average size of your local training groups?</b>	<b>24-25</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	25
<b>J.</b>	<b>What is the size of your annual state-wide conference?</b>	<b>25-26</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	26
<b>K.</b>	<b>What types of training formats are used?</b>	<b>26-28</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	28
<b>L.</b>	<b>Does your APS program provide cross-training to other professionals?</b>	<b>28</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	28
<b>L.1.</b>	<b>If yes, which professionals do you cross-train?</b>	<b>28-30</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	30
<b>M.</b>	<b>What are the topic areas which are covered in your worker training program?</b>	<b>30-33</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table – New Workers	31
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table – Experienced Workers	32
<b>N.</b>	<b>What are the topic areas covered in your supervisory training?</b>	<b>33-34</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	34
<b>O.</b>	<b>What are your state’s unmet APS training needs?</b>	<b>35-37</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Table	35
<b>P.</b>	<b>What obstacles have you encountered from your agency in providing APS training to staff?</b>	<b>37-40</b>
<b>Q.</b>	<b>What strategies have you tried in dealing with administrative obstacles and how successful have you been with each?</b>	<b>40-42</b>
<b>R.</b>	<b>What obstacles have you encountered from local APS staff in providing APS training to them</b>	<b>43-45</b>
<b>S.</b>	<b>What strategies have you tried in dealing with local staff obstacles and how successful have you been with each?</b>	<b>45-48</b>
<b>T.</b>	<b>What plans do you have for future training?</b>	<b>48-51</b>

**Appendices**

1. Letter to State Adult Protective Services Administrators
2. State Adult Protective Services Training Programs—Blank Survey
3. Participating and Non-participating States
4. State Survey Contacts

**A. 1. Do you have an annual APS training budget?**

<b>Total Number of Responses:</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>94.7%</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a Missouri, Pennsylvania.

<i>f</i> Yes:	<b>19</b>	<b>52.8%</b>
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon 1, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> No:	<b>17</b>	<b>47.2%</b>
--------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin.

NOTES a  
 j NH “APS not specified.”  
 j OR2 “Currently lobbying for funds transfer. Requesting \$100 to \$150 K.”  
 j VT “No formal line item.”  
 j WI “Bi-annual training provided.”

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	19	52.8 %
No:	17	47.2 %

**A. 2. Information not available – APS funds not a separate line item.**

<b>Total Number of Responses:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23.7%</b>
-----------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania.

**A. 3. If yes (Q. A.1.), what was your most recent annual training allocation?**

<b>Total Number of Responses:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>50.0%</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<b>Total Amount for all Respondents:</b>	<b>\$2,287,687.00</b>
--	-----------------------

<b>Average Amount for all Respondents:</b>	<b>\$120,405.00</b>
--	---------------------

STATE BY STATE a

<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Arizona	\$35,000	Minnesota	\$1,440
California	\$488,000	Montana	\$10,000
Colorado	\$32,000	Nevada	\$5,000
Guam	\$4,014	New Hampshire	\$15,000
Hawaii	\$9,913	New Jersey	\$75,000
Illinois	\$100,000	New York	\$600,000
Indiana	\$35,000	Tennessee	\$214,000
Iowa	\$53,000	Texas	\$455,000
Maine	\$8,320	Utah	\$10,000
Massachusetts	\$137,000		

NOTES a

- j HI "Fiscal year 2001."
- j ME "\$12,800 in 2002 (approximate)."
- j NH "Total for all training for Adult Services."

HIGHLIGHTS a

Ranking by state, from highest to lowest, for reported annual APS training budget.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1. New York	\$600,000	11. Colorado	\$32,000
2. California	\$488,000	12. New Hampshire	\$15,000
3. Texas	\$455,000	13. Montana	\$10,000
4. Tennessee	\$214,000	13. Utah	\$10,000
5. Massachusetts	\$137,000	15. Hawaii	\$9,913
6. Illinois	\$100,000	16. Maine	\$8,320
7. New Jersey	\$75,000	17. Nevada	\$5,000
8. Iowa	\$53,000	18. Guam	\$4,014
9. Arizona	\$35,000	19. Minnesota	\$1,440
9. Indiana	\$35,000		

**A. 4. What are the sources and annual amounts of funding for your APS training program?**

<b>Total Number of Responses:</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>86.8%</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT

REPORTING a Arkansas, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Virginia.

<i>f</i> <b>Information not available:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
--	----------	-------------

STATES a

Georgia, Oregon.

<i>f</i> <b>Social Services Block Grant:</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,041,000</b>
--	----------	--------------------

STATES a

Alabama, Florida, Missouri, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas.



<i>f</i>	<b>Older Americans Act:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$132,942</b>
----------	-----------------------------	----------	------------------

STATES a                   Guam, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, South Dakota.

<i>f</i>	<b>Medicaid:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$0</b>
----------	------------------	----------	------------

STATES a                   Missouri, Oregon 1.

<i>f</i>	<b>State Funds:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$1,029,913</b>
----------	---------------------	-----------	--------------------

STATES a                   Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Utah, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Local Funds:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$3,832</b>
----------	---------------------	----------	----------------

STATES a                   Guam, Minnesota.

<i>f</i>	<b>TANF:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
----------	--------------	----------	------------

STATES a                   None

<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$32,000</b>
----------	---------------	----------	-----------------

STATES a                   Colorado, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon 1, Vermont, Wisconsin.

STATE BY STATE a       The following provides funding information by state. Many states did not provide source amount information. All comments specific to individual states are in quotes.

**STATE / SOURCE / AMOUNT**

**NOTES / COMMENTS**

AL – SSBG, State Funds

FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED

AZ – State Funds = \$35,000

AR –

NO FUNDING REPORTED

CA – State Funds = \$488,000

CO – Other = \$32,000

“Title XX, but not block grant.”

FL – SSBG, State Funds

FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED

“No specific funding available for training. We do have 15 positions statewide who are responsible for training investigation staff and assist us with training development. Funding pays their salaries.”

GA – Information not available

“There is a social services training budget and APS has a small portion of that \$.”

GU – OAA = \$1,622, Local Funds = \$2,392

HI – State Funds = \$9,913

“FY 2001”

IL – State Funds = \$100,000

IN – State Funds = \$35,000

IA – State Funds = \$53,000

KS – State Funds

FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED

“Amount not available.”

LA – OAA = \$6,000

MA – OAA = \$112,000, State Funds = \$25,000

ME – OAA = \$8320

“For 64 required staff, 2001. “

MN – Local Funds = \$1440

MO – SSBG, OAA, Medicaid, State Funds, Other

“General Revenue. All funds combined total \$165,000.”

MT – State Funds = \$10,000

<u>NV – OAA = \$5,000</u> <u>STATE / SOURCE / AMOUNT</u>	<u>NOTES / COMMENTS</u>
ND -	NO FUNDING REPORTED
NJ – State Funds = \$75,000	“Allocated out of NJ Casino funds. All \$ goes to Rutgers for organized training.
NY – SSBG = \$600,000	
NC -	NO FUNDING REPORTED
OH – Other = NA	“Other = General Revenue Funds.”
OR 1 – OAA, Medicaid, State Funds, Other; “ Other = AARP (little).”	
OR 2 – Information not available	INA “at this time.”
PA – OAA, State Funds	FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED
RI -	NO FUNDING REPORTED
SD – SSBG, OAA	FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED
TN – SSBG	FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED
TX – SSBG = \$227,000+/-, State Funds = \$227,000+/-	
UT – State Funds = \$10,000	
VA -	NO FUNDING REPORTED
VT – State Funds	FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED
WI – Other	“Conference generated fees. Program revenue – Approximately \$25,000 per event.”
WY – State Funds	FUNDING AMOUNTS NOT PROVIDED

**B. Does your state APS training include:**

<b>Total Number of Responses:</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>89.5%</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a Arkansas, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

<i>f</i> <b>Training goals and objectives:</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>79.4%</b>
--	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> <b>Worker certification:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11.8%</b>
---------------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Illinois, New Jersey, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i> <b>APS job competencies:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32.4%</b>
---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Guam, Kansas, Montana, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont.

<i>f</i> <b>Pre / Post test:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>35.3%</b>
----------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, California, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i> <b>Participant evaluation:</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>76.5%</b>
---	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New

Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> Other:	14	41.2%
-----------------	----	-------

STATES a Arizona, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Nevada, Oregon 2, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia.

NOTES a

- j AZ “Individual training needs assessment.”
- “Development of curriculum - legal core.”
- j IA “We provide CEU's for social worker license.”
- j KS “Continuing Education Credits (CEU) towards mandated social workers license renewal.”
- j ME “Required staff are left on their own with their supervisor to select trainings from a general catalog and other provided opportunities.”
- j MN “There is no formal state training program - just an annual conference.”
- j MO “Follow-up assessments.”
- j MT “Risk management.”
- “Policy protocol.”
- j NH “Follow-up goal setting by participants.”
- j ND “No formal training program.”
- j NV “Training program being developed.”
- j OR2 “Developing Worker Certification and APS Job Competencies programs.”
- “Training goals and objectives program is only 12 months old.”
- j VT “To the extent there are certain competencies in the job specs, and if not, a focus in (..?) 6 months of employment.

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Training goals and objectives:	27	79.4 %
Worker certification:	4	11.8 %
APS job competencies:	11	32.4 %
Pre/Post test:	12	35.3 %
Participant evaluation:	26	76.5 %
Other;	14	41.2 %

C. *What are the educational requirements for your APS staff and supervisors?*

Total Number of Responses:	35	92.1%
----------------------------	----	-------

NOT REPORTING a Colorado, Indiana, Wisconsin.

APS STAFF

<i>f</i> High School Graduate:	6	17.1%
--------------------------------	---	-------

STATES a Arizona, California, Georgia, Iowa, Oregon 1, Vermont.

NOTES a j VT “Assistant case managers.”

<i>f</i> Associate Degree:	2	5.7%
----------------------------	---	------

STATES a Illinois, Georgia.

NOTES a j IL "LPN / plus 2 years experience."

<b>f Bachelors Degree:</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>85.7%</b>
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming.

NOTES a j GU "With 3 years experience."  
j IL "Plus 1 year experience."  
j MA "Masters MSW or related degree preferred."  
j NV "Minimum."  
j UT "Investigators / Human Service Workers."

<b>f Masters Degree:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
--------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES a Illinois, Kansas.

NOTES a j KS "Not required."

<b>f Professional Certification / Licensure:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14.3%</b>
--	----------	--------------

STATES a Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Utah.

NOTES a j KS "License mandatory by statute for all social workers."  
j UT "SSW."

<b>f Other:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22.9%</b>
-----------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont.

NOTES a j IL "RN plus 1 year experience."  
j LA "Plus 2 years experience in social services."  
j MA "Appropriate experience."  
j OH "That is set by each county."  
j RI "Extensive experience."  
j VA "Varies by local agency. In general: MSW."  
j VT "We expect/require 3-5 years relevant experience, as well."

### APS SUPERVISORS

<b>f High School Graduate:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
--------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, Georgia, Iowa, Oregon 1.

NOTES a j OR 1 "With specific experience."

<b>f Associate Degree:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
----------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES a Georgia.

<b>f Bachelors Degree:</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>74.3%</b>
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wyoming.

NOTES a j IL "Plus 3 years experience."  
 j MA "Masters MSW or related degree preferred."  
 j NV "Minimum."

<i>f</i> Masters Degree:	5	14.3%
--------------------------	---	-------

STATES a Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Rhode Island.

NOTES a j IL "Plus 1 year experience."  
 j KS "Not required."

<i>f</i> Professional Certification / Licensure:	4	11.4%
--	---	-------

STATES a Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Oregon 2.

NOTES a j KS "License mandatory by statute for all social workers."

<i>f</i> Other:	9	25.7%
-----------------	---	-------

STATES a Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont.

NOTES a j HI "Years of experience can be used as substitution for Masters Degree."  
 j IL "RN plus 3 years experience."  
 j LA "Plus 2 years experience in social services."  
 j MA "Appropriate experience."  
 j OH "That is set by each county."  
 j RI "Extensive experience."  
 j VA "Varies by local agency. In general: MSW."  
 j VT "We expect/require 3-5 years relevant experience, as well."

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# APS STAFF	% APS STAFF	# SUPERVISORS	% SUPERVISORS
High School Graduate:	6	17.1 %	4	11.4 %
Associate Degree:	2	5.7 %	1	2.9 %
Bachelors Degree:	30	85.7 %	26	74.3 %
Masters Degree:	2	5.7 %	5	14.3 %
Professional Certification...:	5	14.3 %	4	11.4 %
Other:	8	22.9 %	9	25.7 %

D. *Who provides training for APS staff in your state?*

Total Number of Responses:	38	100.0%
----------------------------	----	--------

NOT REPORTING a None.

<i>f</i> State APS staff:	33	86.8%
---------------------------	----	-------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a j IL “We use both a state staff person and a local elder abuse program supervisor to co-present.”  
j VA “State APS and regional staff.”

<b>f In-house / On-the-job training:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>73.7%</b>
--	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a j KS “Supervisors.”

<b>f County APS staff:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28.9%</b>
----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a California, Colorado, Georgia, Minnesota, North Carolina, New Jersey, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Wisconsin.

NOTES a j GA “Peers and lead workers.”

<b>f Independent Contractors / Consultants:</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>71.1%</b>
---	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Vermont, Wisconsin.

NOTES a j GA “Consultants” – circled  
j IL “We have a pool of 5 supervisors we have trained with whom we contract on a rotating basis.”  
j KS “Through annual APS conference.”  
j OR 1 “Occasionally.”

<b>f Colleges or Universities:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, California, Iowa, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin.

NOTES a j AL “Some training provided by University of Alabama - School of Social Work.”  
j CA “Various - throughout CA.”  
j IA “Iowa State University.”  
j NJ “Rutgers School of Social Work.”  
j NY “SUNY - Central and Hunter College, Brookdale Center.”  
j TN “University of Tennessee, College of Social Work.”  
j TX “Protective Services Training Institute.”  
j VA “Virginia Commonwealth University.”  
j WI “University of Wisconsin.”

<b>f Other Professionals:</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57.9%</b>
-------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Guam, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming.

NOTES a j IA “We get experts in the area from all over the state.”

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
State APS staff:	33	86.8 %
In-house / On-the-job training:	28	73.7 %
County APS staff:	11	28.9 %
Independent contractors / Consultants:	27	71.1 %
Colleges or Universities:	10	26.3 %
Other Professionals:	22	57.9 %

E. *Training for newly trained APS workers in your state.*

E. 1. *Is training required for new APS staff?*

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING a None.

<i>f</i> <b>Yes:</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>78.9%</b>
----------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> <b>No:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21.1%</b>
---------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Hawaii, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

NOTES a j ND “Not required but provided.”

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	30	78.9 %
No:	8	21.1 %

E. 2. *If yes, how is training mandated in your state?*

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>78.9%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a Hawaii, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

<i>f</i> Required by law:	4	13.3%
---------------------------	---	-------

STATES a Florida, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia.

<i>f</i> Required by regulation:	5	16.6%
----------------------------------	---	-------

STATES a Colorado, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island.

<i>f</i> Administrative decision:	23	76.6%
-----------------------------------	----	-------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming.

NOTES a j GA “We are currently developing an APS specific 7/8 day curriculum. We are currently in pilot with this right now.”

<i>f</i> Other:	5	16.6%
-----------------	---	-------

STATES a Guam, Iowa, Kansas, New York, Virginia.

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Required by law:	4	13.3 %
Required by regulation:	5	16.6 %
Administrative decision:	23	76.6 %
Other:	5	16.6 %

E. 3. *If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for new APS staff?*

Number of States Responding:	28	73.7%
------------------------------	----	-------

NOT

REPORTING a Arkansas, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

NOTES a j CO “Unspecified.”  
j MN “No set time limit.”

Number of states responding in hours:	10	35.7%
---------------------------------------	----	-------

Total number of hours for all states:	680
---------------------------------------	-----

Average number of hours per state:	68.0
------------------------------------	------

STATE	# HOURS	RANK	NOTES
Arizona	80	2	
Florida	240	1	
Montana	8	10	
Nevada	80	2	“This includes OST.”
Oregon 2	12	9	Average of “8 - 16 Hours.”
Rhode Island	60	5	
Texas	48	6	
Utah	48	6	“Or 6 days.”
Vermont	80	2	
Wyoming	24	8	
TOTAL	680		



<b>Number of states responding in days:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>64.3%</b>
<b>Total number of days for all states:</b>	<b>204</b>	
<b>Average number of days per state:</b>	<b>6.8</b>	

STATE	# DAYS	RANK	NOTES
Alabama	3.5	13	
California	30	2	
Georgia	7	10	“Pre-service + 4 hrs. / month in-service.”
Guam	14	5	
Illinois	3	14	
Indiana	30	2	
Iowa	3	14	
Kansas	3	14	
Louisiana	40	1	
Massachusetts	12	6	“12 days initially with 7 to follow.”
Missouri	10	7	
New Jersey	15	4	
New York	8	9	
Ohio	3	14	
Oregon 1	4.5	12	“6 days - Community facility.”
Pennsylvania	3	14	
Tennessee	6	11	
Virginia	9	8	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>204</b>		

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

The following table combines information from all reporting states. Days have been converted to hours and hours have been converted to days for each state depending on what format was originally reported (1 day equals 8 hours). Days and hours for each state are equivalent.

STATE	HOURS	DAYS	RANK
Alabama	28	3.5	20
Arizona	80	10	8
California	240	30	2
Florida	240	30	2
Georgia	56	7	15
Guam	104	14	6
Illinois	24	3	21
Indiana	240	30	2
Iowa	24	3	21
Kansas	24	3	21
Louisiana	320	40	1
Massachusetts	96	12	7
Montana	8	1	28
Missouri	80	10	8
Nevada	80	10	8
New Jersey	120	15	5
New York	64	8	13
Ohio	24	3	21
Oregon 1	36	4.5	19
Oregon 2	12	1.5	27
Pennsylvania	24	3	21
Rhode Island	60	7.5	14
Tennessee	48	6	16
Texas	48	6	16
Utah	48	6	16
Vermont	80	10	8
Virginia	72	9	12
Wyoming	24	3	21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2304</b>	<b>288</b>	

**E. 4. What basic core competencies are required for new APS staff?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>73.7%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT

REPORTING a

Hawaii, Indiana, North Carolina, New Hampshire, Nevada, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

STATE BY STATE a

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| Alabama  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Understanding of Alabama APS law and other laws affecting APS population."</li> <li>2. "Requirements of APS investigations as established by agency policy standards for documentation."</li> </ol>                |
| Arkansas | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Review of APS policy, law and internal operations manual is covered during a 40 hour / 1 week in-house training program."</li> </ol>   |
| Arizona  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Adult Services practice."</li> <li>2. "Case work process and case planning in Adult Services."</li> <li>3. "Adult Development and the Aging Process."</li> <li>4. "Separation and Loss and Legal Core."</li> </ol> |

<b>California</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Program Statute Regulations."</li> <li>2. "Policies and procedures."</li> <li>3. "Investigations."</li> <li>4. "Case Management."</li> </ol>
<b>Colorado</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "There are no formal core competencies required for APS workers."</li> <li>2. "Colorado is in the process of developing core computer based competencies at this time."</li> </ol>
<b>Florida</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "None required at this time."</li> </ol>
<b>Georgia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Not competency based at this time."</li> </ol>
<b>Guam</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Basic investigative techniques."</li> <li>2. "Communication techniques."</li> <li>3. "Problem solving techniques s."</li> </ol>
<b>Iowa</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "State laws, regulations, policies, normal aging, characteristics of MR/DD/MI population."</li> <li>2. "Alzheimer's."</li> <li>3. "Substitute decision makers (guardians, etc...)." </li> <li>4. "Legal issues."</li> <li>5. "How to write a report."</li> </ol>
<b>Illinois</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Description of T.L. Elder Abuse program."</li> <li>2. "Caseworker roles."</li> <li>3. "Dynamics and abusive relationships."</li> <li>4. "Intake, assessment, case work and follow-up processes."</li> <li>5. "Documentation."</li> <li>6. "Interviewing."</li> </ol>
<b>Kansas</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "APS statutes to determine validity of a report."</li> <li>2. "Social worker understands dual responsibility of APS: protect vulnerable adults and to support self-determination of competent adults."</li> <li>3. "Knowledge and understanding of APS policies and procedures as stated in manual."</li> </ol>
<b>Louisiana</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "On the job training (OJT)."</li> </ol>
<b>Maine</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Core competencies not identified by program."</li> </ol>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Knowing laws and regulations."</li> <li>2. "Interviewing and assessment skills."</li> <li>3. "Understanding family dynamics."</li> <li>4. "Understanding the coping process, mental health and ethical issues."</li> </ol>
<b>Minnesota</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Investigative techniques.."</li> <li>2. "Interviewing skills."</li> <li>3. "Report Writing."</li> <li>4. "Protective service plans."</li> </ol>
<b>Missouri</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Although there currently is no testing, training is conducted on the following: interviewing, investigating, laws, mental health issues, protective oversight, interventions and medical issues."</li> </ol>
<b>Montana</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Policy manual."</li> <li>2. "Protocol."</li> <li>3. "Agency responsibilities."</li> </ol>

New Jersey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Using APS laws in NJ."</li> <li>2. "Understanding aging and self neglect."</li> <li>3. "Interviewing and gaining access."</li> <li>4. "Understanding and interviewing abuse victims and perpetrators."</li> <li>5. "Recognizing medical issues in neglect/abuse."</li> <li>6. "Addressing financial exploitation."</li> <li>7. "APS assessment skills."</li> <li>8. "Recording skills."</li> <li>9. "Working with disabled and mentally ill clients."</li> <li>10. "Ethics."</li> </ol>
New York	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Basic training - PSA Institute."</li> <li>2. "Legal aspects of PSA and yearly update, by half-day teleconference."</li> </ol>
North Dakota	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "None - but I sure would be interested in a core program. Do you have one available?"</li> </ol>
Ohio	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Legal issues in APS."</li> <li>2. "APS Practice."</li> <li>3. "Adult development and the aging process"</li> <li>5. "APS case management and case planning."</li> <li>5. "APS Investigation."</li> <li>6. "Separation and loss in APS."</li> </ol>
Oregon 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Legal authority."</li> <li>2. "Types of abuse."</li> <li>3. "Theory and philosophy."</li> <li>4. "Investigation."</li> <li>5. "Determine capacity."</li> <li>6. "Interviewing (A/V, ASP, etc...)." </li> <li>7. "Writing reports."</li> <li>8. "Interventions."</li> <li>9. "Criminal statutes."</li> <li>10. "Cultural diversity."</li> </ol>
Oregon 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Mandatory abuse DAR's interpretation."</li> <li>2. "Investigation mapping."</li> <li>3. "Disabilities training in D.D. and/or mental health certification."</li> <li>3. "Elements of report writing."</li> </ol>
Rhode Island	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Social worker skills."</li> <li>2. "Investigation techniques."</li> <li>3. "Decision making."</li> <li>4. "Development of case plans."</li> </ol>
Tennessee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Ethics awareness."</li> <li>2. "Knowledge of APS law/policies."</li> <li>3. "Interviewing skills."</li> <li>4. "Investigative/assessment skill."</li> <li>5. "Service provision."</li> <li>6. "Documentation skills."</li> </ol>
Texas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "See attached."</li> </ol>
Utah	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Philosophy."</li> <li>2. "Law enforcement."</li> <li>3. "Indicators of criminal activity."</li> <li>4. "Healthy aging."</li> <li>5. "LTCO policy."</li> <li>6. "Capacity to consent."</li> <li>7. "Area agencies on aging."</li> </ol>

8. "Legal issues."
9. "Case presentation / discussion."
10. "Service plan development."
11. "Documentation."
12. "Diversity."
13. "Values and ethics."
14. "Assessment and decision making."

- Vermont
1. "Basic/ advanced interviewing skills (we hire only those with these skills)."
  2. "Knowledge of crisis and mediation interventions."
  3. "Knowledge of human service delivery system - either/or both - aging, disabilities."
  4. "Excellent communication skills, demonstrated - verbal and written."
  5. "Knowledge of APS statute. Basics of how to conduct an investigation, write substantiation reports."

**E. 5. Are newly hired APS staff allowed in the field before completing basic training?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>92.17%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT

REPORTING a North Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

<i>f</i> Yes:	<b>23</b>	<b>63.9%</b>
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas\*, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES a j CO "It is usual that APS workers are "senior caseworkers" and have many years of experience in the social services area that are applicable and transferable to the APS area. It is preferable that all staff has specific, documented baseline training but it isn't always the case that workers that are newly assigned to APS receive training before going into the field, especially in small counties where in-house training opportunities (such as shadowing another worker) may be limited."

j \*KS *Kansas answered Yes and No. See notes for details.*

j KS "If previous experience. Depends on previous social work experience."

j NH "For first time we have provided training, but it is not officially required."

j OR 2 "Unfortunately."

<i>f</i> No:	<b>13</b>	<b>36.1%</b>
--------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arkansas, California, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Kansas\*, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

NOTES a j \*KS *Kansas answered Yes and No. See notes for details.*

j GA "At present."

j KS "If no previous experience. Depends on previous social work experience."

j OH "Depends on county."

j VT "Field work is conducted only in conjunction with another staff member for first 4-6 weeks."

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	23	63.9 %
No:	13	36.1 %

**F. Training for experienced APS workers in your state.**

**F.1. Is ongoing training required for experienced APS staff?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING a      None.

<i>f</i> <b>Yes:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>52.6%</b>
----------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a      Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New York, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia.

NOTES a      j OR 2 “Varies by county.”

<i>f</i> <b>No:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>47.4%</b>
---------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a      Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a      j MO “Offered but not required.”  
 j NJ “Not recognized, but offered twice per year.”  
 j ND “Not required but provided.”  
 j OR 1 “Two statewide conferences are offered each year.”

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	20	52.6 %
No:	18	47.4 %

**F. 2. If yes, how is training mandated in your state?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>63.2%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING α      Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> <b>Required by law:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
----------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a      Georgia, Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Virginia.

NOTES a      j GA “Requires (no funding) training on elder abuse.”  
 j IA “2 hours every 5 years for mandatory reporters, which APS are.”

<i>f</i> <b>Required by regulation:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
---	----------	--------------

STATES a Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island.

<i>f</i>	<b>Administrative decision:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
----------	---------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Colorado, Florida, Guam, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia.

NOTES a j CO “Training is a regulatory requirement but regulations do not specify or differentiate between new or experienced staff.”

<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8%</b>
----------	---------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Kansas, Maine, New Jersey, Vermont, Virginia.

NOTES a j KS “Statute mandates social workers maintain a license. Renewable every 2 years, through proof of training - CEU.”  
 j ME “Training required to maintain social work license, not APS specific.”  
 j NJ “Topics for advanced/experienced staff are suggested by supervisors to Rutgers University School of Social Work which offers workshops each year.”  
 j VT “I encourage/recommend and scrounge for both \$ and time.”  
 j VA “State Board of Social Services has approved minimum training standards plan.”

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Required by law:	6	25.0 %
Required by regulation:	4	16.7%
Administrative decision:	15	62.5%
Other:	5	20.8%

**F. 3. *If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for experienced APS staff?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>50.0%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<b>Number of states responding in hours:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>73.7%</b>
<b>Total number of hours for all states:</b>	<b>264.4</b>	
<b>Average number of hours per state:</b>	<b>18.9</b>	

STATE	HOURS	RANK	NOTES
Florida	48	1	"4 hours per month"
Iowa	0.4	13	"2 hours every 5 years."
Indiana	32	3	
Illinois	8	11	
Louisiana	40	2	"Yearly."
Maine	25	4	
Minnesota	8	11	
Montana	20	5	
Nevada	15	9	"Per year."
New Jersey	10	10	"Offered each year."
New York	2	13	
Texas	16	8	"Advanced investigation. 24 Hours program refresher."
Utah	20	5	
Virginia	20	5	"Annually."
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>264.4</b>		

<b>Number of states responding in days:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
<b>Total number of days for all states:</b>	<b>17</b>	
<b>Average number of days per state:</b>	<b>3.4</b>	

STATE	DAYS	RANK	NOTES
Guam	3	2	
Kansas	3	2	
Massachusetts	7	1	"7 days minimum.."
Pennsylvania	1	5	
Vermont	3	2	"2 - 4 days per year."
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>		

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

The following table combines information from all reporting states. Days have been converted to hours and hours have been converted to days for each state depending on what format was originally reported (1 day equals 8 hours). Days and hours for each state are equivalent.

STATE	HOURS	DAYS	RANK
Florida	48	6	2
Guam	24	3	6
Iowa	0.4	.05	19
Indiana	32	4	4
Illinois	8	1	15
Kansas	24	3	6
Louisiana	40	5	3
Maine	25	3.125	5
Massachusetts	56	7	1
Minnesota	8	1	15
Montana	20	2.5	9
Nevada	15	1.875	13
New Jersey	10	1.25	14
New York	2	.25	18
Pennsylvania	8	1	15
Texas	16	2	12
Utah	20	2.5	9
Vermont	24	3	6
Virginia	20	2.5	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>400.4</b>	<b>50.05</b>	



**F. 4. What basic core competencies are required for experienced APS workers?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34.2%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a** Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

**NOTES a**

- j CO “No core competency requirements for experienced workers.”
- j FL “None required at this time.”
- j GA “Not Available.”
- j ME “Core competencies not identified by program.”
- j NJ “This varies a lot - no specific basic core competencies.

**STATE BY STATE a**

- Guam**
  - 1. “Basic interviewing techniques.”
  - 2. “Investigative techniques.”
- Illinois**
  - 1. “Elder abuse, elder rights and/or domestic violence is required for in-service training.”
- Massachusetts**
  - 1. “3 components of advanced interviewing skills.”
  - 2. “4 components of financial exploitation investigation training.”
- Minnesota**
  - 1. “Levels of evidence.”
  - 2. “Specialized training for persons with unique needs.”
  - 3. “Cultural diversity.”
  - 4. “Data practices.”
  - 5. “Court testimony.”
- Missouri**
  - 1. “Performance evaluations include: review of investigatory and interviewing skills, complete documentation and knowledge and use of community resources.”
- Montana**
  - 1. “All areas.”
- New York**
  - 1. “Legal aspects of PSA - updates.”
- Ohio**
  - 1. “APS: Placement issues with adult clients.”
  - 2. “APS: Adult services with special populations.”
  - 3. “APS: Preparing and presenting for court.”
- Oregon 2**
  - 1. “Currently this is not universal statewide.”
  - 2. “Interviewing techniques for special populations is usually the first requirement, otherwise it varies by county program and D.D. or M.H. certification.”
- Rhode Island**
  - 1. “Ethics.”
  - 2. “Dealing with difficult clients.”
  - 3. “Stress.”

- |         |    |  |
|---------|----|--|
| Texas   | 1. | “Same as above - workers are expected to have competency in these areas within 2 years.”   |
| Utah    | 1. | “We have not outlined "core competencies" in our advanced training, rather, we require the training be related to adult services job duties and current issues.” |
| Vermont | 1. | “Intervention / crisis / basic interviewing and advanced techniques.”  |
|         | 2. | “Substance abuse issues re: elders..”  |
|         | 3. | “Mental health/aging/dementia/ related issues.”  |
|         | 4. | “How to conduct investigations. New investigating techniques and approaches.”  |

**G.1. Is ongoing training required for APS Supervisors?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

NOT REPORTING a      None.

<i>f</i> <b>Yes:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>52.6%</b>
----------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a      Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia.

NOTES a      j FL      “No training currently available which is specific to supervisors. Required to complete all investigator training and attend in-service training.”  
                   j IA      “For mandatory reporters.”  
                   j MO      “Offered but not required.”

<i>f</i> <b>No:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>47.4%</b>
---------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a      Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Kansas, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a      j NJ      “Not required but offered twice per year.”  
                   j OR2      “Unaware of any requirements. I'm working toward recommendations.”

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	20	52.6 %
No:	18	47.4 %

**G. 2. If yes, how is training mandated in your state?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57.9%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING  $\alpha$  Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Required by law:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
----------	-------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES *a* Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia.

<i>f</i>	<b>Required by regulation:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
----------	--------------------------------	----------	-------------

STATES *a* Illinois, Pennsylvania.

<i>f</i>	<b>Administrative decision:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59.1%</b>
----------	---------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES *a* Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
----------	---------------	----------	--------------

STATES *a* Kansas, Maine, New Jersey, Texas, Vermont, Virginia.

NOTES *a*

- j* KS “Statute mandates social workers maintain a license. Renewable every 2 years, through proof of training - CEU.”
- j* ME “Training required to maintain social work license, not APS specific.”
- j* NJ “Topics suggested by supervisors are usually offered as workshops during the year.”
- j* TX “Supervisors are required to attend agency management training and APS supervisors training - 40 hours each.”
- j* VT “I require training for myself because it is essential to my professional development.”
- j* VA “State Board SS has approved minimum training standards plan.”

**SUMMARY TABLE *a***

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Required by law:	6	27.3 %
Required by regulation:	2	9.1%
Administrative decision:	13	59.1%
Other:	6	27.3 %

**G. 3. *If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for APS Supervisors?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>52.7%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING *a* Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES *a* *j* RI “Not defined.”

<b>Number of states responding in hours:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60.0%</b>
<b>Total number of hours for all states:</b>	<b>335.4</b>	
<b>Average number of hours per state:</b>	<b>28.0</b>	

STATE	HOURS	RANK	NOTES
Florida	48	2	"4 hours per month."
Illinois	10	9	"In-service training plus a two-day retreat annually."
Indiana	32	4	
Iowa	0.4	12	"2 hours every 5 years."
Louisiana	40	3	
Maine	25	5	
Minnesota	8	11	
Nevada	15	8	"Per year."
New Jersey	10	10	
Texas	107	1	"New Supervisors 80 hours plus 3 1/2 day workshops."
Utah	20	6	
Virginia	20	6	"Annually."
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>335.4</b>		

<b>Number of states responding in days:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
<b>Total number of days for all states:</b>	<b>37.5</b>	
<b>Average number of days per state:</b>	<b>4.7</b>	

STATE	DAYS	RANK	NOTES
Georgia	14	1	"For all supervisors. Not specific to APS."
Guam	3	4	
Kansas	3	4	
Massachusetts	6	3	"7 days minimum.."
Montana	2	5	
New York	2	5	
Pennsylvania	1	6	
Vermont	6.5	2	"5 - 8 days per year."
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37.5</b>		

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

The following table combines information from all reporting states. Days have been converted to hours and hours have been converted to days for each state depending on what format was originally reported (1 day equals 8 hours). Days and hours for each state are equivalent.

STATE	HOURS	DAYS	RANK
Florida	48	6	4
Georgia	112	14	1
Guam	24	3	9
Illinois	10	1.25	16
Indiana	32	4	7
Iowa	.4	.05	20
Kansas	24	3	9
Louisiana	40	5	6
Maine	25	3.125	8
Massachusetts	48	6	4
Minnesota	8	1	18
Montana	16	2	13
Nevada	15	1.875	15
New Jersey	10	1.25	16
New York	16	2	13
Pennsylvania	8	1	18
Texas	107	13.375	2
Utah	20	2.5	11
Vermont	52	6.5	3
Virginia	20	2.5	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>635.4</b>	<b>79.425</b>	

**G. 4. What basic core competencies are required for APS supervisors?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28.9%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a**

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

**NOTES a**

- j CO "None."
- j GA "None."
- j MN "None specified in law."
- j NJ "No specific competencies."

**STATE BY STATE a**

- Guam
  1. "Supervisory techniques."
  2. "Problem solving techniques."
  3. "Communication techniques."
- Illinois
  1. "Elder abuse, elder rights and/or domestic violence in-service training is required."
  2. "In addition, must attend 2 day intensive which focuses on different topics each year."
  - 3.
- Maine
  1. "Core competencies not identified by program."
- Massachusetts
  1. "Varies based on needs in a given year. However, we focus on how to supervise, how to review records and how to evaluate employees and identify and meet training needs or skill deficiencies."

Missouri	1. "Performance evaluations include reading and approving all probationary workers' case documentation, utilization of the on-the-job training manuals with new staff, regular review of PS case documentation of other staff."
Montana	1. "Monthly supervisors meeting all areas."
Ohio	1. "APS: Placement issues with adult clients." 2. "APS: Adult services with special populations." 3. "APS: Preparing and presenting for court."
Rhode Island	1. "Dealing with staff." 2. "Conflict resolution."
Texas	1. "See attached."
Utah	1. "Currently they are the same as those for experienced APS workers. Additional training sessions are held on an "as needed" basis."
Vermont	1. "3-5 years supervisory experience." 2. "BA/BS in Psychology, gerontology, social work, criminal justice, etc..." 3. "3-5 years experience in field of aging, disabilities and administration." 4. "Excellent, demonstrated written/verbal skills."

**H. *How frequently must staff have additional training?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>76.3%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT

REPORTING a Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a

j GA "No plan at present."  
j NH "Currently not required."

**New Workers**

<b>Annually:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37.9%</b>
------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.

<b>Semi-annually:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13.8%</b>
-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Guam, Indiana, New York, Oregon 2.

<b>As Needed:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37.9%</b>
-------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas.

<b>Other:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.8%</b>
---------------	----------	-------------

STATES a Iowa, Louisiana.

**Experienced Workers**

<b>Annually:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37.9%</b>
------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, Guam, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.

<b>Semi-annually:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17.2%</b>
-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Indiana, Louisiana, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Vermont.

<b>As Needed:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>55.2%</b>
-------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont.

<b>Other:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.4%</b>
---------------	----------	-------------

STATES a Missouri.

**Supervisors**

<b>Annually:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.

<b>Semi-annually:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Indiana, Louisiana, Oregon 2.

<b>As Needed:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
-------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont.

<b>Other:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Iowa, Missouri, Rhode Island.

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

TYPE OF WORKER	ANNUALLY	SEMI-ANNUALLY	AS NEEDED	OTHER
New Workers:	11	4	13	2
Experienced Worker:	11	5	16	1
Supervisors:	14	3	14	3

TYPE OF WORKER	ANNUALLY %	SEMI-ANNUALLY %	AS NEEDED %	OTHER %
New Workers:	37.9%	13.8%	37.9%	6.8%
Experienced Worker:	37.9%	17.2%	55.2%	3.4%
Supervisors:	48.3%	10.3%	48.3%	10.3%

NOTES a                    j AR    “None required.”  
                                   j FL    “4 Hours per month.”  
                                   j MO    “Not required for any group.”  
                                   j NY    “It is provided.”  
                                   j NC    “No requirements - this item answers based on practice.”  
                                   j TX    “However, additional training is required for certificate.”  
                                   j FL    “4 Hours per month.”

**I.     *What is the average size of your local training groups?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>92.1%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a            Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota.

<b>1 - 10:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14.3%</b>
----------------	----------	--------------

STATES a                    California, Florida, Kansas, Oregon 1, Tennessee.

NOTES a                    j FL    “Low turnover in staff.”

<b>11 - 20:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37.1%</b>
-----------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a                    Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia.

NOTES a                    j VA    “For course work.”

<b>21 - 30:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>28.6%</b>
-----------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a                    Alabama, Colorado, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, North Carolina, Oregon 2, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES a                    j VA    “New worker training.”

<b>Other:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25.7%</b>
---------------	----------	--------------

STATES a                    Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a                    j CO    “One recent training included 106 persons - about 55 APS.”  
                                   j GU    “30+.”  
                                   j HI    “40 per session.”  
                                   j NV    “Varies.”  
                                   j PA    “40-50.”  
                                   j UT    “30-50.”  
                                   j VT    “Depends on topic and who is presenting.”  
                                   j WI    “100-125. When regional trainings are offered.”  
                                   j UT    “30-50.”



**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
1 – 10:	5	14.3 %
11 – 20:	13	37.1 %
21 – 30:	10	28.6 %
Other:	9	25.7 %

**J. What is the size of your annual state-wide conference?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>92.1%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a      Hawaii, New Hampshire, North Dakota.

<b>30 - 50:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
-----------------	----------	-------------

STATES a      Guam, Montana.

<b>51 - 75:</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8.6%</b>
-----------------	----------	-------------

STATES a      Indiana, Maine, Utah.

<b>76 - 100:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
------------------	----------	-------------

STATES a      Rhode Island, Wyoming.

<b>101 - 150:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
-------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a      Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Tennessee.

<b>150 +:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>45.7%</b>
---------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a      Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin.

NOTES a      j GA    “We don't have a regular annual conference. But when we do there are approximately 250-300.”  
                   j IL    “350 – 400.”  
                   j OR1 “300 - It's multi-disciplinary.”  
                   j WI    “Approximately 400-450 individuals per conference.”

<b>No State-wide Conference:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22.9%</b>
----------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a      Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Vermont, Virginia.

NOTES a      j AR    “For APS.”  
                   j NJ    “We have only a statewide conference for administrators and supervisors. It is called "Executive Forum".  
                   j VA    “No statewide conference sponsored by discipline.”

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
30 - 50:	2	5.7 %
51 - 75:	3	8.6 %
76 - 100:	2	5.7 %
101 - 150:	4	11.4 %
150 +:	16	45.7 %
No State-wide Conference:	8	22.9 %

**K. What types of training formats are used?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>97.4%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT

REPORTING a North Dakota.

<i>f</i> <b>Reading manuals/regulations:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>75.7%</b>
--	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.

<i>f</i> <b>Role-plays:</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>56.8%</b>
-----------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wisconsin.

<i>f</i> <b>Videotaping of participants:</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18.9%</b>
--	----------	--------------

STATES a Colorado, Guam, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Tennessee.

<i>f</i> <b>Computer based training:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24.3%</b>
--	----------	--------------

STATES a California, Indiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Virginia.

<i>f</i> <b>Viewing films and/or videos:</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>89.2%</b>
--	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i> <b>Lecture:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>94.6%</b>
--------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a j OR 1 "By local and national speakers."

<i>f</i>	<b>Discussion:</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>97.3%</b>
----------	--------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Case studies:</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>89.2%</b>
----------	----------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Experiential Exercises:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>45.9%</b>
----------	--------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21.6%</b>
----------	---------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon 1, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTES a  
j KS "In process of developing video conferencing for new workers."  
j MN "Peer monitoring."  
j MO "On the job training manuals as well as classroom."  
j NV "Staff shadowing."  
j OR1 "MDT Workgroups."  
j VT "Case study group at least bi-monthly."

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Reading Manuals/regulations:	28	75.7 %
Role-plays:	21	56.8 %
Videotaping of participants:	7	18.9 %
Computer based training:	9	24.3 %
Viewing films and/or videos:	33	89.2 %
Lecture:	35	94.6 %
Discussion:	36	97.3 %
Case studies:	33	89.2 %
Experiential Exercises:	17	45.9 %
Other:	8	21.6 %

**L. Does your APS program provide cross-training to other professionals?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>97.4%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a North Dakota.

<i>f</i>	<b>Yes:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>94.6%</b>
----------	-------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a  
 j AL “Some done locally and through specific inter-agency collaboration on specific topics”  
 j AZ “In-services.”  
 j AR “Limited.”  
 j NY “Not as an ongoing part of our responsibilities but as asked and when we are working in conjunction with another profession.”  
 j WI “Each statewide conference focuses on collaboration.”

<i>f</i>	<b>No:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.4%</b>
----------	------------	----------	-------------

STATES a New Hampshire, South Dakota.

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes:	35	94.6 %
No:	2	5.4 %

**L.1. *If yes, which professionals do you cross-train?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>94.6%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

NOT REPORTING a New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota.

<i>f</i>	<b>Law enforcement:</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>91.4%</b>
----------	-------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

NOTES a j GA “Some.”

<i>f</i>	<b>Bank employees:</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>68.6%</b>
----------	------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.

<i>f</i>	<b>Health care providers:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>80.0%</b>
----------	-------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

<i>f</i>	<b>Aging network:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>80.0%</b>
STATES a	Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Physicians:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37.1%</b>
STATES a	Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah.		
NOTES a	j OR2 “Physicians when they agree to attend.”		
<i>f</i>	<b>Nurses:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>54.3%</b>
STATES a	Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Long term care ombudsman:</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>65.7%</b>
STATES a	Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Legal services providers:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>51.4%</b>
STATES a	Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, Montana, New York, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Judges:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
STATES a	Florida, New Jersey, Vermont, Wisconsin.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Domestic violence service providers:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>48.6%</b>
STATES a	Florida, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wisconsin.		
NOTES a	j IL “Sporadic.”		
<i>f</i>	<b>All mandatory reporters:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>34.3%</b>
STATES a	Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont.		
<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>28.6%</b>
STATES a	Colorado, Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon 1, Tennessee, Wisconsin.		

- NOTES a
- j CO “Assistance payment workers, child welfare workers, field administrators.”
  - j IN “EMS, Fire, Safety.”
  - j MN “Mental health providers.”
  - j MO “Prosecutors.”
  - j NJ “Cross training with mental health, developmental disabilities, offices on aging. Done by Rutgers University.”
  - j NJ “In service done in most counties - varying topics depending on county.”
  - j NC “CPS staff.”
  - j OR1 “Indian tribe.”
  - j TN “Allow a limited, as requested basis.”
  - j WI “Humane society staff/animal control officers.

SUMMARY TABLE a

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
Law enforcement:	32	91.4 %
Bank employees:	24	68.6 %
Health care provider:	28	80.0 %
Aging network:	28	80.0 %
Physicians:	13	37.1 %
Nurses:	19	54.3 %
Long term care ombudsman:	23	65.7 %
Legal services providers:	18	51.4 %
Judges:	4	11.4 %
Domestic Violence service providers:	17	48.6 %
All mandatory reporters:	12	34.3 %
Other:	10	28.6 %

M. *What are the topic areas which are covered in your worker training program?*

New Workers

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>89.5%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

SUMMARY TABLE a

TOPIC AREA	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
1. Self-awareness	13	38.2%	37
2. Ethical dilemmas/decision-making	24	70.6%	15
3. State Criminal codes	24	70.6%	15
4. APS state law, regulations and policies	33	97.1%	1
5. Basic communication/Interviewing skills	28	82.4%	7
6. Working with law enforcement	26	76.5%	11
7. Gaining Access to clients	22	64.7%	18
8. Worker Safety	21	61.8%	20
9. Risk Indicators	27	79.4%	9
10. Physical abuse	32	94.1%	3
11. Sexual Abuse	30	88.2%	4
12. Financial Exploitation	33	97.1%	1
13. Neglect by caregivers	28	82.4%	7
14. Self-neglect	29	85.3%	5
15. Family Dynamics	17	50.0%	29
16. Working with difficult people	22	64.7%	18
17. Normal vs. Abnormal Aging	21	61.8%	20
18. Working with people with disabilities	21	61.8%	20
19. Working with people with mental illness	20	58.8%	23
20. Working with culturally diverse populations	15	44.1%	32
21. Domestic Violence	18	52.9%	27

22. Medications	16	47.1%	30
23. Caregiver related issues	16	47.1%	30
24. Working with perpetrators	20	58.8%	23
25. Investigation techniques: community-based	29	85.3%	5
26. Investigation techniques: Facilities	15	44.1%	32
27. Assessment	26	76.5%	11
28. Document Skills	27	79.4%	9
29. State probate codes	13	38.2%	37
30. Capacity/incapacity	26	76.5%	11
31. Guardianship duties and responsibilities	23	67.6%	17
32. Money management	10	29.4%	39
33. Interagency relationships/coalition building	18	52.9%	27
34. Resource development	14	41.2%	35
35. Burnout/stress management	15	44.1%	32
36. Collecting evidence of financial exploitation	25	73.5%	14
37. Dementia	19	55.9%	25
38. Undue influence	14	41.2%	35
39. Interviewing skills for special populations	19	55.9%	25
40. Other (See Notes Below)	6	17.6%	40

### New Workers

- NOTES a
- j AZ “Some of these areas are covered during statewide conference.”
  - j CO “It is not easy to differentiate training that is provided exclusively to each category (new or experienced). Colorado training efforts are not particularly targeted for one group or another. For example, our state-wide conference would include attendance by all levels of staff. The information provided here is based on interviews with a sample of APS caseworkers and supervisors and a review of program materials. As expected, training differs by county and not all counties are necessarily trained on the same subjects. I did not differentiate between training provided to counties by the state and training that counties arrange/provide themselves.”
  - j MA “All of the above in some capacity.”
  - j MO “Medical Training.”
  - j NY “Substance and alcohol abuse.”
  - j OR 2 ”We offer or coordinate the topics - cannot yet mandate statewide.
  - j TN “Hoarding behavior and interventions.”
  - j UT “Mediation.”

### Experienced Workers

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>65.8%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

SUMMARY TABLE a

TOPIC AREA	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
1. Self-awareness	6	24.0%	39
2. Ethical dilemmas/decision-making	18	72.0%	4
3. State Criminal codes	17	68.0%	7
4. APS state law, regulations and policies	21	84.0%	1
5. Basic communication/Interviewing skills	13	52.0%	25
6. Working with law enforcement	21	84.0%	1
7. Gaining Access to clients	9	36.0%	36
8. Worker Safety	16	64.0%	11
9. Risk Indicators	16	64.0%	11
10. Physical abuse	18	72.0%	4
11. Sexual Abuse	16	64.0%	11
12. Financial Exploitation	20	80.0%	3
13. Neglect by caregivers	16	64.0%	11
14. Self-neglect	16	64.0%	11





STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont.

<i>f</i>	<b>Leadership:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
----------	--------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i>	<b>Data Analysis:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8%</b>
----------	-----------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a California, Minnesota, Montana, Rhode Island, Texas.

<i>f</i>	<b>Adult Learning Style:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
----------	------------------------------	----------	--------------

STATES a California, Colorado, Georgia, New York, New Jersey, Oregon 2, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i>	<b>Developing Performance Measures:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>54.2%</b>
----------	---	-----------	--------------

STATES a California, Colorado, Georgia, Guam, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah.

<i>f</i>	<b>Dealing with Personnel Issues:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>83.3%</b>
----------	---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Guam, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont.

<i>f</i>	<b>Training Techniques/Tech. Pres. Skills:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
----------	--	----------	--------------

STATES a California, Colorado, Guam, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Texas.

<i>f</i>	<b>Worker Evaluation:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
----------	---------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Guam, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah.

<i>f</i>	<b>Values and Ethics:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
----------	---------------------------	-----------	--------------

STATES a Arizona, California, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon 2, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont.

<i>f</i>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
----------	---------------	----------	--------------

STATES a Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, Tennessee, Virginia.

NOTES a  
 j IL “Supervisor's responsibilities.”  
 j MO “Motivation.”  
 j NC “Same as above” From question M: 2. Ethical dilemmas/decision-making, 3. State Criminal codes, 4. APS state law, regulations and policies, 6. Working with law enforcement, 10. Physical abuse. 12. Financial

Exploitation, 13. Neglect by caregivers, 14. Self-neglect, 15. Family Dynamics, 16. Working with difficult people, 17. Normal vs. Abnormal Aging, 27. Assessment, 29. State probate codes, 30. Capacity/incapacity.

- j NJ “Dealing with change.”
- j TN “Data capture training.”
- j TN “Employee assistance program orientation.”
- j TN “Sexual harassment prevention.”
- j VA “Same as above.” From question M: 4. APS state law, regulations and policies, 5. Basic communication/Interviewing skills, 6. Working with law enforcement, 7. Gaining Access to clients, 8. Worker Safety, 10. Physical abuse, 11. Sexual Abuse, 12. Financial Exploitation, 17. Normal vs. Abnormal Aging, 21. Domestic Violence, 24. Working with perpetrators, 25. Investigation techniques: community-based, 26. Investigation techniques: Facilities, 27. Assessment, 28. Document Skills, 30. Capacity/incapacity, 31. Guardianship duties and responsibilities, 36. Collecting evidence of financial exploitation, 38. Undue influence.

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

RESPONSE	# RESPONSES	PERCENT
<b>Conflict Resolution:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>66.7%</b>
<b>Teambuilding:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>75.0%</b>
<b>Leadership:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8%</b>
<b>Adult Learning Style:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
<b>Developing Performance Measures:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>54.2%</b>
<b>Dealing with Personnel Issues:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>83.3%</b>
<b>Training Techniques/Tech. Pres. Skills:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
<b>Worker Evaluation:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
<b>Values and Ethics:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
<b>Other: (See Notes for Details)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25.0%</b>

**O. What are your state’s unmet APS training needs?**

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>44.7%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a**

Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon 1, Oregon 2, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

**NOTES a**

- j AL “Need an advanced training curriculum for experienced workers.”
- j UT “Most topics are covered - our battle is funding.”

**SUMMARY TABLE a**

TOPIC AREA	NUMBER	PERCENT	RANK
1. Self-awareness	9	52.9%	5
2. Ethical dilemmas/decision-making	6	35.3%	15
3. State Criminal codes	5	29.4%	27
4. APS state law, regulations and policies	2	11.8%	38
5. Basic communication/Interviewing skills	3	17.6%	36
6. Working with law enforcement	2	11.8%	38
7. Gaining Access to clients	6	35.3%	15
8. Worker Safety	5	29.4%	27

9. Risk Indicators	7	41.2%	11
10. Physical abuse	2	11.8%	38
11. Sexual Abuse	4	23.5%	30
12. Financial Exploitation	4	23.5%	30
13. Neglect by caregivers	3	17.6%	36
14. Self-neglect	4	23.5%	30
15. Family Dynamics	7	41.2%	11
16. Working with difficult people	10	58.8%	2
17. Normal vs. Abnormal Aging	6	35.3%	15
18. Working with people with disabilities	7	41.2%	11
19. Working with people with mental illness	9	52.9%	5
20. Working with culturally diverse populations	10	58.8%	2
21. Domestic Violence	6	35.3%	15
22. Medications	8	47.1%	8
23. Caregiver related issues	6	35.3%	15
24. Working with perpetrators	9	52.9%	5
25. Investigation techniques: community-based	6	35.3%	15
26. Investigation techniques: Facilities	4	23.5%	30
27. Assessment	4	23.5%	30
28. Document Skills	6	35.3%	15
29. State probate codes	6	35.3%	15
30. Capacity/incapacity	6	35.3%	15
31. Guardianship duties and responsibilities	4	23.5%	30
32. Money management	6	35.3%	15
33. Interagency relationships/coalition building	8	47.1%	8
34. Resource development	10	58.8%	2
35. Burnout/stress management	7	41.2%	11
36. Collecting evidence of financial exploitation	5	29.4%	27
37. Dementia	6	35.3%	15
38. Undue influence	8	47.1%	8
39. Interviewing skills for special populations	6	35.3%	15
40. Other (See Notes Below)	16	94.1%	1

#### STATE BY STATE a

- j AZ
  1. **Specialized training: Adult services w/special populations.**
  2. **Specialized training: Family assessment and counseling.**
  3. **Specialized training: Cultural competence.**
  4. **Specialized training: Adult psychopathology.**
  5. **Specialized training: Time and stress management.**
  6. **Specialized training: Worker safety.**
  
- j CO
  1. **New and Experienced staff: Suicide prevention.**
  2. **Supervisors: Grant writing.**
  3. **Supervisors: Legislative process.**
  
- j FL
  1. **Supervisory training.**
  2. **Protective supervision training.**
  
- j GA
  1. **Funding.**
  2. **Trainers with APS experience.**
  3. **Standard plan for yearly opportunities for experienced work.**
  
- j GU
  1. **Data analysis for supervisors.**
  2. **Adult learning styles for supervisors.**
  
- j IL
  1. **“APS services are provided through local, not for profit or public agencies that are designated, trained and monitored (and funded, of course) by the Department of AAA's.”**
  
- j KS
  1. **Conflict Resolution.**
  2. **Teambuilding.**

3. Leadership.
  4. Data Analysis.
  5. Adult learning styles.
  6. Developing performance measures.
  7. Dealing with personnel issues.
  8. Training techniques/technical presentation skills.
  9. Worker evaluation.
  10. Values and Ethics.
  11. M1-39 ongoing - specifically focusing on advanced worker skills.
  12. N1-10 ongoing - specifically focusing on advanced worker skills.
- j ME
1. Teambuilding.
  2. Leadership.
  3. Adult learning styles.
  4. Developing performance measures
  5. Adult learning styles.
  6. Developing performance measures.
  7. Dealing with personnel issues.
  8. Training techniques/technical presentation skills.
  9. Worker evaluation.
  10. Values and Ethics
- j MO
1. Family dynamics.
  2. Cross training with other agencies such as prosecutors, financial institutions, first responders and more with law enforcement.
  3. Some kind of certification training for our staff.
- j NH
1. Supervisors: Conflict Resolution.
  2. Supervisors: Teambuilding.
  3. Supervisors: Leadership.
  4. Supervisors: Data Analysis.
  5. Supervisors: Adult learning styles.
  6. Supervisors: Developing performance measures.
  7. Supervisors: Dealing with personnel issues.
  8. Supervisors: Training techniques/technical presentation skills.
  9. Supervisors: Worker evaluation.
  10. Supervisors: Values and Ethics.
- j NJ
1. More training in NJ APS rules and regulations.
  2. More training in using APS law to prosecute perpetrators and training of judges.
- j OR 1
1. Supervisors - Conflict Resolution.
  2. Supervisors – Teambuilding.
  3. Supervisors – Leadership.
  4. Supervisors - Data Analysis.
  5. Supervisors - Adult learning styles.
  6. Supervisors - Developing performance measures.
  7. Supervisors - Dealing with personnel issues.
  8. Supervisors - Training techniques/technical presentation skill.
  9. Supervisors - Worker evaluation.
  10. Supervisors - Values and Ethics.
  11. New Workers - Data recording.
- j OR 2
1. “Death investigations A-Z.”
  2. “Working with medical providers and through forensics evidence collection, analysis and reporting.”
- j TN
1. New Workers – Working with culturally diverse populations
  2. New Workers – Domestic Violence.

3. New Workers – Investigation techniques: facilities
4. New Workers – Collecting evidence of financial exploitation.
5. New Workers – Undue influence
6. New Workers - Hoarding behavior and interventions.
7. Supervisors - Teambuilding
8. Supervisors - Leadership
9. Supervisors - Adult learning styles.
10. Supervisors - Worker evaluation.

- j VT
1. “Investigation techniques: community based (we have had some but can always use more.”
  2. “Building resilience in staff.”

**P. *What obstacles have you encountered from your agency in providing APS training to staff?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>81.6%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a**                      Arkansas, Iowa, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

**STATE BY STATE a**

**ALABAMA**

1. Lack of funding.
2. No staff to develop/provide advanced training for experienced staff or basic training on a regularly scheduled basis.

**ARIZONA**

1. None since the training money was appropriated.

**ARKANSAS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**CALIFORNIA**

1. Funding.

**COLORADO**

1. APS at the State level is under-funded and understaffed.

**FLORIDA**

1. Lack of specific funding and dedicated staff to provide and develop training. Currently done with existing resources.

**GEORGIA**

1. Lack of support for designated trainers.
2. Financial support @ level needed.

**GUAM**

1. The lack of professionals in the field of APS (elderly persons with a disability) issues.

**HAWAII**

1. Approval for expenditure of funds to contract consultants with APS expertise and knowledge to present advanced level training.

**ILLINOIS**

1. Conflicting dates for required trainings from other programs.

2. Agency is strongly supportive of training in general.

**INDIANA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**IOWA**

1. No funding from Feds.

**KANSAS**

1. Lack of resources.
2. Budget restrictions.
3. APS is a lower priority than other programs.

**LOUISIANA**

1. Funding.

**MAINE**

1. APS staff denied access to MSW courses offered to CPS staff
2. Priority of training opportunities and support staff not the same as CPS staff \$ for training. Training as a priority with staff dedicated to this effort.
3. Regional APS staff generally left on their own to seek new training.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

1. None. Administration very supportive.

**MINNESOTA**

1. No specific training funds.

**MISSOURI**

1. Required training for all staff not just new employees.

**MONTANA**

1. Money.

**NEVADA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

1. Not sufficient resources.

**NEW JERSEY**

1. No increase in training funding for 10 years.
2. State APS office has gone through decrease in staff in the past 6 years, and currently has no administrator (D. Ricci is Acting Administrator).

**NEW YORK**

1. Lack of training funds.

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NORTH DAKOTA**

1. No budget.
2. No core training requirements.
3. Voluntary reporting.

**OHIO**

1. None

**OREGON 1**

1. Funding.
2. Time.

3. Lack of supervisor involvement.

**OREGON 2**

1. Financial restrictions due to conflicting priorities for \$.Time.
2. Statewide agency reorganization logistics.
3. Valuing time for ongoing and advanced training for all levels.
4. Need for people in the field doing the job while not adequately trained. It is an unfunded mandate.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**RHODE ISLAND**

1. Resources for staff to attend training.

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**TENNESSEE**

1. Restrictions for all state agencies on in-state and out-of-state travel due to budgeting constraints.

**TEXAS**

1. Money to cover training expenses for training.
2. Time to attend training
3. Lack of understanding of need for, and importance of specific training, e.g. domestic violence.

**UTAH**

1. None - the only problem we tend to have is that we have very low turnover, thus, it makes it difficult to plan/hold new employee certification training.

**VERMONT**

1. We look adequate \$ to provide sufficient structured training program.
2. We have a very small staff; this makes it difficult to make the time needed to get staff to training.
3. Some staff are reluctant to commit to time.

**VIRGINIA**

1. We have the training because of the strong advocacy of the long-term care network.

**WISCONSIN**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WYOMING**

1. In the past APS was not viewed as very important. Resources were focused more on children and youth. This is changing.

**Q. *What strategies have you tried in dealing with administrative obstacles and how successful have you been with each?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>65.8%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a**

Arkansas, California, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

**STATE BY STATE a**

**ALABAMA**

1. Requested additional funding and staff for training.
2. Not yet successful; requested incorporation in family services training.

**ARIZONA**

1. Not Applicable

**ARKANSAS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**CALIFORNIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**COLORADO**

1. The department has submitted requests to the legislature to fund APS training at the state level. The outcome of this request has not yet been determined.
2. Opportunities for APS staff to participate in training that other divisions offer is being explored.
3. The State is determining the feasibility of partnering with college or university to jointly establish a training program.
4. Ways to transfer funds from other programs have been explored (without success).
5. Seeking funds from private sources has been minimally attempted (one small donation toward training was made).
6. APS partnered with another division (mental health) to provide joint training and shared costs.
7. Assistance from another division has been obtained in the development (incomplete) of a computerized training program for new workers; the Department is active in increasing visibility of APS across its divisions to increase commitment of others to address training related issues.

**FLORIDA**

1. Development of budget request to establish a competency based training program. Not supported.

**GEORGIA**

1. Legislative - added a requirement for training to APS law.
2. Program Review Report – pointed out a major recommendation was in the area of training
3. Begged, begged and advocated.

**GUAM**

1. APS has established a collaborative effort with the Guam Police Department and other agencies dealing with domestic violence.

**HAWAII**

1. Present justification papers with substantive data and rationale. For training budget, approval.

**ILLINOIS**

1. We now have a centralized calendar to assist with scheduling all department trainings.

**INDIANA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**IOWA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**KANSAS**

1. Communicating APS successes and client needs via memos and agency newsletter.
2. Consistent focus on APS program needs.

**LOUISIANA**



**NOT REPORTED**

**MAINE**

1. Encourage more APS specific training in statewide conference.
2. Outlining and explaining the need for training new and experienced staff.
3. Providing information from other states and APS programs (I.e. Texas
4. Minimal success to this point but \$15,000 has been recently identified to develop APS specific training (I.e. institute - "first step").

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**MINNESOTA**

1. We use the mandate of the law requiring 8 hours of annual training to obtain APS conference funds.

**MISSOURI**

1. Funding is a state issue which our administrators advocate for but have little control.
2. Continuous effort by numerous staff to relay the importance of on-going training to administration.

**MONTANA**

1. Joint training with aging network, I and A, ombudsman.

**NEVADA**

1. No obstacles - administration is supportive of training.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NEW JERSEY**

1. We have addressed the question of increased funding, but were unsuccessful.
2. The fund amount was set in 1992 and attempts to get more \$ for training were futile.

**NEW YORK**

1. We try to partner with universities and utilize professionals on a multi-disciplinary basis who will work with our staff without charge.
2. We use teleconferences very successfully.

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NORTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**OHIO**

**NOT REPORTED**

**OREGON 1**

1. Management has recently expressed interest and intends to meet with us.

**OREGON 2**

1. Statewide focus groups conducted with providers, PCI's and consumers - report to be written and presented to all.
2. Collaborative cross agency training. Fair level of success in justifying resources.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**RHODE ISLAND**

1. Providing evidence of the worth of training.

**SOUTH DAKOTA  
NOT REPORTED**

**TENNESSEE**

1. APS takes advantage of opportunities to "take" or "bring" the trainers to staff in order to limit travel concerns, and to take advantage of local events.

**TEXAS**

1. Advocacy up and down the chain of command - not very successful.
2. Advocacy and clear expectations that staff be able to attend training (workload and emergencies covered) - Moderately successful.
3. Identify needs and advocate.

**UTAH**

1. The only obstacle we generally face is funding, thus, we often have to be "creative" in our planning and budgeting - we rely heavily on experts who are willing to provide free training.

**VERMONT**

1. Modest success; 4 staff have attended training programs that proved good resources (cost \$).
2. All staff participate in case study reviews.
3. We are getting 1 new APS position, which will (..?..)

**VIRGINIA**

1. We have the training because of the strong advocacy of the long-term care network.

**WISCONSIN**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WYOMING**

1. Shared specific case examples, provided information from national efforts including newsletters.
2. Forward issues that came from elder abuse list serves. Response has been positive.

---

**R. *What obstacles have you encountered from local APS staff in providing APS training to them?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>76.3%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT**

**REPORTING a**

Arkansas, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin.

**STATE BY STATE a**

**ALABAMA**

1. None - staff are very receptive to training.

**ARIZONA**

1. Travel time.
2. Heavy caseloads.
3. Veteran staff did not feel they needed training.

**ARKANSAS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**CALIFORNIA**

1. Some resistance to being trained by someone who does do or hasn't done the actual job.

## **COLORADO**

1. APS workers are generally very interested in any opportunity to attend training programs. County directors routinely indicate that APS training is needed.
2. Counties do not have adequate staff coverage when workers attend training.
3. County staff generally must travel far distances as there are limited opportunities to provide regional training (which still requires considerable travel for some).
4. Training needs are often contextual so that generic programs may have limited applicability.
5. Funds to pay for travel or lodging are few.
6. Caseworkers who primarily provide services to children and only occasionally provide APS services are more likely to attend child welfare training if staff can only attend one or two programs a year.

## **FLORIDA**

1. None - They have been very receptive to the APS training.

## **GEORGIA**

1. Pulling workers out of field for 3-4 days @ a time.
2. Cross training with APS since some "may" have to take an APS case.
3. Supervisors sometimes don't coach the OJJ.

## **GUAM**

1. Establishing topics with local presenters relative to APS/domestic violence issues.

## **HAWAII**

1. Purchase of service providers not always able to attend due to travel costs or staff availability.

## **ILLINOIS**

1. Agencies which have a big turnover in staff, sometimes complain about the training expenses that they absorb.
2. Occasionally, due to low #'s of certified caseworkers, agencies find it difficult to wait to scheduled training.

## **INDIANA**

1. The logistics of training personnel from the field.

## **IOWA**

1. Our staff also do child abuse, which has a huge joint Federal and State budget. It's hard to get them to go to APS training.

## **KANSAS**

1. Nothing from staff. APS staff are always eager for and accepting training.
2. APS staff serve as committee members for APS conference and provide suggestions.

## **LOUISIANA**

**NOT REPORTED**

## **MAINE**

1. None. Regional APS staff open to new training opportunities.
2. APS staff need and want more training.
3. Serving old and disabled victims is currently not a priority therefore the needs of the staff that serve them are not as well.

## **MASSACHUSETTS**

1. Some are resistant to training.
2. Others do not want to travel to attend training.

## **MINNESOTA**

1. None - We are the local APS agency and our staff highly value training.

## **MISSOURI**

1. Apathy.
2. Resistance to change.
3. Workload.

#### **MONTANA**

1. Money.

#### **NEVADA**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **NEW HAMPSHIRE**

1. None. Staff has been crying for training.

#### **NEW JERSEY**

1. Overall, response has been positive!
2. Sometimes workload problems if training doesn't seem relevant.
3. Sometimes the training location of the basic worker training.

#### **NEW YORK**

1. Lack of staff to cover while other staff attend training.
2. We use teleconferences very successfully.

#### **NORTH CAROLINA**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **NORTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **OHIO**

1. County directors refusing to release staff for training.

#### **OREGON 1**

1. Balancing old and new information.

#### **OREGON 2**

1. Resistance to "state" authority over them.
2. Too busy in the field also carrying caseloads.

#### **PENNSYLVANIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **RHODE ISLAND**

1. Lack of time to attend.

#### **SOUTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **TENNESSEE**

**NOT REPORTED**

#### **TEXAS**

1. Workload - concern that they will fall further behind.
2. Lack of administrative support for hard money.
3. Difficulty creating targeted training that will meet the needs of a large, diverse staff.

#### **UTAH**

1. Many of the "seasoned" staff feel they "already know everything". Thus, it is often challenging to plan topics/training sessions that are both applicable/necessary and somewhat "new" to seasoned staff.

#### **VERMONT**

1. Some staff are reluctant to attend - a bit of the "I know it all" attitude.

**VIRGINIA**

1. None to date.

**WISCONSIN**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WYOMING**

1. Since workers do many more CPS cases APS is sometimes viewed as a lower priority but increasingly workers want APS training.

**S. *What strategies have you tried in dealing with local staff obstacles and how successful have you been with each?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57.9%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT REPORTING a**                      Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin.

**STATE BY STATE a**

**ALABAMA**

1. NA - Local staff are encouraged to provide training in the community. Success varies.

**ARIZONA**

1. Train locally.
2. Mandatory training.

**ARKANSAS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**CALIFORNIA**

1. Local participation in the process, development of and delivery of the training. Works well.

**COLORADO**

1. The State does not charge a registration fee and pays for lodging for the annual conference. This is also done with regional trainings when possible.
2. Sensitivity to community culture is addressed by involving local persons in training endeavors where possible to help make trainings applicable and practical. These actions enhance attendance at training programs and have been successful as measured by staff evaluations of trainings.

**FLORIDA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**GEORGIA**

1. We have recommended APS case-workers become specialized to APS program. No decision yet.
2. Pushing for additional travel funds.

**GUAM**

1. Through collaborative effort with the Legal Assistance Services Provider, the American Association of Retired Persons favorably approved our grant request for training. Training took place as part of our annual celebration of Senior Citizens Month, May 21-24, 2001. Training topics included: Fraud Awareness, Disability Retirement/Work Incentives, Guardianship and Alternatives and Elder Abuse.

**HAWAII**

**NOT REPORTED**

**ILLINOIS**

1. From time to time we have provided special trainings for agencies who are so low of certified staff.

**INDIANA**

1. We have given our training sites either at the state capital or at special other locations that reduce travel expenditures for staff that are attending.

**IOWA**

1. Try to have really good training - good reputation for providing good training.

**KANSAS**

**NOT REPORTED**

**LOUISIANA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**MAINE**

**NOT REPORTED**

**MASSACHUSETTS**

1. We call the CEO of the agency and try to enforce compliance. This usually works.

**MINNESOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**MISSOURI**

1. Some training has been provided locally therefore decreasing time out of office.

**MONTANA**

1. Joint networking locally.

**NEVADA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NEW JERSEY**

1. We have moved the basic worker training site around north and south New Jersey, offering 9 sessions in the north and 6 sessions in the south.
2. Rutgers has an Advisory Council of APS supervisors.

**NEW YORK**

1. We try to involve the supervisors in deciding the type of trainings we make available to their staff.

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NORTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**OHIO**

1. Offering training in the county agency.

**OREGON 1**

1. Having trainings just for new workers and bigger trainings for all.
2. We also hold intensives and have a joint conference with mental health APS.

**OREGON 2**

1. Statewide focus groups conducted with providers, PCI's and consumers - report to be written and presented to all.
2. Collaborative cross agency training. Fair level of success in justifying resources.
3. Also have gone to the regions and counties with some trainings for local groups - this is very successful.
4. Also shamelessly provide APS trainers with food and drink. They love it as a gesture.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**RHODE ISLAND**

**NOT REPORTED**

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**TENNESSEE**

**NOT REPORTED**

**TEXAS**

1. Advocacy up and down the chain of command - not very successful.
2. Advocacy and clear expectations that staff be able to attend training (workload and emergencies covered) - Moderately successful.
3. Identify need and advocate.

**UTAH**

1. Prior to our annual conference I survey staff mainly requesting training topics/presenters and then plan the conference based on majority opinion.
2. This past year we "recognized" staff by holding the training in the area of the state that the majority preferred.

**VERMONT**

1. Direct "you must" (limited success).
2. Job coaching (moderately successful).
3. Modified expectations - substantiated case studies bi-monthly for more structured programs.

**VIRGINIA**

1. Implementation begins in 2003.

**WISCONSIN**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WYOMING**

1. I have created 6 committees to review and develop new rules and policy. People from other agencies have been included. Early response has been very positive.

**T. *What plans do you have for future training?***

<b>Number of States Responding:</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>84.2%</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

**NOT REPORTING a** Louisiana, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin.

**STATE BY STATE a**

**ALABAMA**

1. Will continue to offer basic APS training at least annually.
2. Hope to develop an advanced APS training curriculum for experienced workers.

## **ARIZONA**

1. **Develop specialized training.**

## **ARKANSAS**

1. **Quarterly APS staff training along with supervisor training.**

## **CALIFORNIA**

1. **Statewide APS social worker training academy**

## **COLORADO**

1. **Complete the development of core computer based training for new staff.**
2. **Provide additional regional training on a mental health APS protocol.**
3. **Continue to hold the annual statewide APS conference.**
4. **Plan and conduct a training opportunity for APS supervisors.**
5. **Continue to pursue a relationship with gerontology or other program that will assist in training development and in obtaining funding for both training and research.**
6. **Explore opportunities to partner with other programs in their training endeavors.**
7. **Our APS county/state plan has identified numerous goals related to training both APS workers and community participants such as law enforcement, court personnel, mental health workers.**

## **FLORIDA**

1. **Adapt departmental curriculum for supervisory training for APS supervisors.**
2. **Develop a certification program for APS investigation staff.**
3. **Work toward better collaboration on training initiatives with Department of Elder Affairs.**

## **GEORGIA**

1. **We are developing new worker training now.**
2. **We want to get funding and staff to provide ongoing veteran worker training.**

## **GUAM**

1. **To continue working with Guam Police Department and extend to other agencies in setting a collaborative effort (MOU) in dealing and serving victims of domestic violence on Guam.**
2. **As funds are identified, to bring professionals from off-island to train APS specific topics to the APS staff and collaborative partners in the helping profession.**

## **HAWAII**

1. **Dr. Holly Ramsey-Klasnik will be presenting a workshop on working with perpetrators including investigative skills and interventions with the offender.**

## **ILLINOIS**

1. **We are currently in the process of developing a two-day re-certification training which will be mandatory for all caseworkers and supervisors on a three year cycle.**

## **INDIANA**

1. **Continuing with same annual format.**
2. **Heavy on criminal justice and forensic issues, while building self-image and confidence levels.**

## **IOWA**

1. **Use your (NAAPSA) great list. I already faxed it to my trainer up at Iowa State University. We are taking copies of it to our conference committee meeting this week.**

## **KANSAS**

1. **Move towards computer based training on manual.**
2. **Continuation of APS conferences.**
3. **APS supervisors quarterly meetings consists of training and administrative/policy input.**
4. **Locate outside resources and staff to meet training needs.**

## **LOUISIANA**

**NOT REPORTED**



**MAINE**

1. NAAPSA trying to collaborate with regional states to share resources for APS training.
2. Regional staff advocating and researching the development of a "APS institute" structure.
3. Hopeful changes are occurring.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

1. Continue what we are doing, evaluate and make changes that are necessary.

**MINNESOTA**

1. Interviewing developmentally disabled clients who are victims of sexual abuse.

**MISSOURI**

1. Full training assessment to identify training needs, regionally as well as statewide, to identify core competencies.
2. Increase awareness and efforts to cross-train with outside agencies.
3. Considering expanding current training requirements from 10 to 15 days.
4. Statewide training for experienced staff based on identified needs.
5. Development of web based training.

**MONTANA**

1. April, 2002 statewide training.

**NEVADA**

1. Discharge Planning Conference - to focus on prevention of unsafe discharges to the community.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

1. NH is proposing reclassification of social workers into specialists for perpetrator fraud and self-neglect.
2. We are proposing a comprehensive training program, required annual advanced training and training for supervisors. My response to this survey next year will be quite different.

**NEW JERSEY**

1. We'll continue our basic training and advanced training and supervisor training.
2. There's an interest in hoarding behavior as a topic.

**NEW YORK**

1. We will increase teleconferences and attempt to do regionally based training to reduce travel.

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**NORTH DAKOTA**

1. We will provide "sessions on vulnerable adult" issues @ other statewide conferences.

**OHIO**

1. None.

**OREGON 1**

1. Specialized training for screeners and intake workers.

**OREGON 2**

1. Considerable. Am currently awaiting receipt of budget and roll out of comprehensive training plan which includes annual statewide conference.
2. Quarterly regional trainings.
3. Distribution of forensics training videos and creation of CBT unit on mandatory abuse.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

1. Have requested federal funds to create a Protective Services training institute within the school of social work at Temple University. This institute will provide comprehensive,

multi-disciplinary training to AAA PS staff, law enforcement and other interested professions.

**RHODE ISLAND**  
**NOT REPORTED**

**SOUTH DAKOTA**  
**NOT REPORTED**

**TENNESSEE**

1. Curricula being developed for experienced workers.
2. Writing plans for service provision (completed).
3. Assessing capacity/undue influence.
4. Conducting community investigations.
5. Conducting investigations in facilities. .
6. Curriculum for new and experienced supervisors in development.

**TEXAS**

1. Expand specialized training workshops provided by training institute.
2. Development of "tune-up" refresher training for tenured staff in guardianship and facility.
3. Review and revamp existing basic trainings.

**UTAH**

1. We will continue with new employee certification training, annual conference and cross training on hoarding, utilizing reasonably priced, yet highly knowledgeable national presenters.

**VERMONT**

1. Develop a more structured training program incorporating topics identified here; and by staff.
2. Work with legal association to develop/sponsor New England "Training Day" for APS staff.

**VIRGINIA**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WISCONSIN**

**NOT REPORTED**

**WYOMING**

1. We are coordinating with the Division on Aging to plan a multi-agency conference for the summer of 2002. We have a planning commission representing several agencies.

---

**REPORT END**

Dear Adult Protective Services State Administrator:

As part of NAAPSA's partnership in the National Center on Elder Abuse, we have agreed to conduct a Baseline Study of APS programs in the United States. The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive, nation-wide overview of Adult Protective Services which will be used to make best practice and policy recommendations at the state and national levels.

Rather than overwhelm the states with one enormous survey, we have divided the project into a number of small, specific questionnaires which we will be sending to you during the next year.

Attached you will find the first survey which focuses on **training**. This survey was developed in collaboration with Susan Castano, Trainer and Consultant, and Ada Saperstein, Program Coordinator at the Continuing Education and Professional Development Program of Rutgers School of Social Work. Susan and Ada will be presenting some of the information gleaned from this survey at a workshop on "Secrets to Successful APS Training" in San Antonio in November.

A wide range of additional topics will be included in the Study. They include:

- training and educational requirements for workers and supervisors;
- states' responses to financial exploitation cases
- state program administrative structures
- caseload information and staffing levels
- program standards and performance measures
- funding
- public awareness activities
- the availability of legal counsel for APS programs
- what APS state administrators see as the most significant problems facing the field
- what assistance APS state administrators need to improve protective services to vulnerable adults.

Please give this **training survey** to the most appropriate person in your state office. Ask him or her to complete the survey and return it to Susan Castano **no later than Friday, August 31, 2001**. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is included for your convenience.

Thank you so much for your help in gathering this important information. Our goal is to have a response from every state APS program in the United States.

Sincerely,

Joanne Otto  
Executive Director



**D. Who provides training to APS staff in your state?** (Please check all that apply)

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_ State APS staff
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_ In-house/ on the job training
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_ County APS staff
- 4. \_\_\_\_\_ Independent contractors/consultants
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_ College or University (Please name) \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_ Other professionals - law enforcement, mental health, etc.

**E. Training for newly hired APS workers in your state:**

- 1. Is training required for new APS staff? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. If yes, how is training mandated in your state? (Please check all that apply)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by law
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by regulation
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative decision
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please describe) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. If yes, how many hours / days of training are required for new APS staff?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hours / Days (Please circle one)
- 4. What basic core competencies are required for new APS workers?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Are newly hired APS staff allowed in the field before completing basic training?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**F. Training for experienced APS workers in your state:**

- 1. Is ongoing training required for experienced APS staff? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. If yes, how is training mandated in your state? (Please check all that apply)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by law
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by regulation
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative decision
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please describe) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. If yes, how many hours/days of ongoing training are required for experienced APS staff?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hours / Days (Please circle one)
- 4. What basic core competencies are required for experienced APS workers?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**G. Training for APS Supervisors in your state:**

1. Is ongoing training required for APS Supervisors? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
2. If yes, how is training mandated in your state? (Please check all that apply)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by law
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Required by regulation
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative decision
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please describe) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. If yes, how many hours/days of ongoing training are required for APS Supervisors?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hours / Days (Please circle one)
4. What basic core competencies are required for APS Supervisors?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**H. How frequently must staff have additional training?**

	<u>New Workers</u>	<u>Experienced</u>	<u>Supervisors</u>
1. Annually	_____	_____	_____
2. Semi-annually	_____	_____	_____
3. As needed	_____	_____	_____
4. Other	_____	_____	_____

**I. What is the average size of your local training groups?**

- |                |                      |
|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. _____ 1-10  | 3. _____ 20-30       |
| 2. _____ 11-20 | 4. _____ Other _____ |

**J. What is the size of your annual state-wide conference?**

- |                 |                                   |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. _____ 30-50  | 4. _____ 101-150                  |
| 2. _____ 51-75  | 5. _____ 150+                     |
| 3. _____ 76-100 | 6. _____ No state-wide conference |

**K. What types of training formats are used? (Please check all that apply)**

- |                                      |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. _____ Reading manuals/regulations | 6. _____ Lecture                |
| 2. _____ Role-plays                  | 7. _____ Discussion             |
| 3. _____ Videotaping of participants | 8. _____ Case studies           |
| 4. _____ Computer based training     | 9. _____ Experiential Exercises |
| 5. _____ Viewing films and/or videos | 10. _____ Other _____           |

**L. Does your APS program provide cross-training to other professionals?**

Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, which professionals do you cross-train? (Please check all that apply)

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. _____ Law enforcement      | 7. _____ Long term care ombudsman         |
| 2. _____ Bank employees       | 8. _____ Legal services providers         |
| 3. _____ Health care provider | 9. _____ Judges                           |
| 4. _____ Aging network        | 10. _____ Dom. violence service providers |
| 5. _____ Physicians           | 11. _____ All mandatory reporters         |
| 6. _____ Nurses               | 12. _____ Other _____                     |

**M. What are the topic areas which are covered in your worker training program?** (Please check all that apply and add additional topics if applicable)

	<u>New Workers</u>	<u>Experienced Workers</u>
1. Self-awareness	_____	_____
2. Ethical dilemmas/decision-making	_____	_____
3. State Criminal codes	_____	_____
4. APS state law, regulations and policies	_____	_____
5. Basic communication/Interviewing skills	_____	_____
6. Working with law enforcement	_____	_____
7. Gaining Access to clients	_____	_____
8. Worker Safety	_____	_____
9. Risk Indicators	_____	_____
10. Physical abuse	_____	_____
11. Sexual Abuse	_____	_____
12. Financial Exploitation	_____	_____
13. Neglect by caregivers	_____	_____
14. Self-neglect	_____	_____
15. Family Dynamics	_____	_____
16. Working with difficult people	_____	_____
17. Normal vs. Abnormal Aging	_____	_____
18. Working with people with disabilities	_____	_____
19. Working with people with mental illness	_____	_____
20. Working with culturally diverse populations	_____	_____
21. Domestic Violence	_____	_____
22. Medications	_____	_____
23. Caregiver related issues	_____	_____
24. Working with perpetrators	_____	_____
25. Investigation techniques: community-based	_____	_____
26. Investigation techniques: facilities	_____	_____
27. Assessment	_____	_____
28. Document Skills	_____	_____
29. State probate codes	_____	_____
30. Capacity/incapacity	_____	_____
31. Guardianship duties and responsibilities	_____	_____
32. Money management	_____	_____
33. Interagency relationships/coalition bldg.	_____	_____
34. Resource development	_____	_____
35. Burnout/stress management	_____	_____
36. Collecting evidence of financial exploitation	_____	_____
37. Dementia	_____	_____
38. Undue influence	_____	_____
39. Interviewing skills for special populations	_____	_____
40. Other_____	_____	_____

**N. What are the topic areas covered in your supervisory training?**

1. _____ Conflict Resolution	7. _____ Dealing with personnel issues
2. _____ Teambuilding	8. _____ Training techniques/technical presentation skills
3. _____ Leadership	9. _____ Worker evaluation
4. _____ Data Analysis	10. _____ Values and Ethics
5. _____ Adult learning styles	11. _____ Other_____
6. _____ Developing performance measures	

**O. What are your state’s unmet APS training needs?** (Use numbers for questions “M”1-40, and “N” 1-11, and add any topics not covered in those questions).

---

---

**P. What obstacles have you encountered from your agency administration in providing APS training to staff?**

---

---

---

**Q. What strategies have you tried in dealing with administrative obstacles and how successful have you been with each?**

---

---

---

**R. What obstacles have you encountered from local APS staff in providing training to them?**

---

---

---

**S. What strategies have you tried in dealing with local staff obstacles, and how successful have you been with each?**

---

---

---

**T. What plans do you have for future training?**

---

---

---

**Thank you very much for your help in this survey.**

Please return this survey to:  
Susan Castano, 2066 East Wellington Road, Newtown, PA 18940  
Phone (215) 860-6967 Fax (732) 445-0580 E-mail: [scastano@voicenet.com](mailto:scastano@voicenet.com)

**PLEASE RETURN NO LATER THAN FRIDAY, AUGUST 31, 2001**



## STATE SURVEY CONTACTS

### Alabama

Doris Ball  
Program Manager  
Department of Human Resources  
Office of Adult Services  
50 Ripley Street  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
334-242-1355  
334-353-1052  
[dball@dhr.state.al.us](mailto:dball@dhr.state.al.us)

### Arizona

Tina Dannenfels  
APS Operations Manager  
Aging and Adult Administration  
Adult Protective Services  
1789 W. Jefferson  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
602-542-4446  
602-542-6575  
[tdannenfordmail.de.state.az.us](mailto:tdannenfordmail.de.state.az.us)

### Arkansas

Raymond Vining  
Program Supervisor  
Adult Protective Services  
P.O. Box 1437 Slot 1412  
Little Rock, AR 72203  
501-682-8495  
501-682-6383  
[ray.vining@mail.state.ar.us](mailto:ray.vining@mail.state.ar.us)

### California

K.J. Acosta  
APS Bureau Chief  
CDSS  
744 P Street, MS1996  
Sacramento, CA 95014  
916-229-0321  
None  
[jacosta@dss.ca.gov](mailto:jacosta@dss.ca.gov)

### Colorado

Paulette St. James  
Administrator  
Colorado State Adult Protection Services  
1575 Sherman Street  
Denver, CO 80210  
303-866-2676  
303-866-2696  
[paulette.stjames@state.co.us](mailto:paulette.stjames@state.co.us)

### Indiana

Patrick Calkins  
State Program Coordinator  
Family and Social Services Administration  
402 West Washington  
Indianapolis, IN 46207  
317-232-0135  
317-232-7867  
[pcalkins@fssa.state.in.us](mailto:pcalkins@fssa.state.in.us)

### Florida

Chris E. Shoemaker  
Sr. Management Analyst Supervisor  
Department of Children and Families  
Adult Protective Services  
1317 Winewood Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
850-922-4076  
850-922-4193  
[chris\\_shoemaker@dcf.state.fl.us](mailto:chris_shoemaker@dcf.state.fl.us)

### Georgia

Mary Martha Allen  
Social Services Program Consultant  
Georgia Department of Human Resources  
Division of Family and Children Services  
2 Peachtree Street, NW 18.253  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
404-657-3421  
404-657-3486  
[mmallen@dhr.state.ga.us](mailto:mmallen@dhr.state.ga.us)

### Guam

Arthur D. San Agustin  
Administrator, Division of Senior Citizens  
Department of Public Health and Social Services  
P.O. Box 2816  
Hagatma, GU 96932  
671-475-0265  
671-477-2930  
[arthursa@mail.gov.gu](mailto:arthursa@mail.gov.gu)

### Hawaii

Elaine Sandobal  
Staff Development Specialist  
Department of Human Services  
Social Services Division  
420 Waiakamilo Road, Room 117A  
Honolulu, HI 96817  
808-832-5123  
808-832-5013

### Illinois

Kathleen Quinn  
Chief, Bureau of Elder Rights  
Illinois Department on Aging  
421 East Capital  
Springfield, IL 62701  
217-785-3386  
217-524-9644  
[kathleen-Quinn@aging.state.il.us](mailto:kathleen-Quinn@aging.state.il.us)

### Massachusetts

Gregory Giuliano  
Director of Protective Services  
Executive Office of Elder Affairs  
1 Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 01208  
617-222-7464  
617-727-9368  
[gregory.giuliano@state.ma.us](mailto:gregory.giuliano@state.ma.us)

**Iowa**

Sandi Koll  
Program Manager, Adult Protective Services  
Iowa Department of Human Services  
Hoover Building, 1305 East Walnut  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
515-281-6219  
515-281-4243  
[skoll@dhs.state.ia.us](mailto:skoll@dhs.state.ia.us)

**Kansas**

Rosalie Sacks  
APS Program Manager  
Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services  
DSOB - 681 West, 915 S.W. Harrison  
Topeka, KS 66612  
785-368-8105  
785-296-0146  
[sacks@srs.kansas.org](mailto:sacks@srs.kansas.org)

**Louisiana**

Robert Seemann  
Director  
Elderly Protective Services  
Governor's Office of Elderly Affairs - LA  
412 North 4th Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70802  
225-342-9722  
225-342-7144  
[bobseemann@go.com](mailto:bobseemann@go.com)

**Maine**

Ricker Hamilton  
Protective Program Administrator  
Department of Human Services  
161 Marginal Way  
Portland, ME 04101  
207-822-2150  
207-822-2162  
[ricker.hamilton@state.me.us](mailto:ricker.hamilton@state.me.us)

**New Hampshire**

David Siress  
Community Services Manager  
Division of Elderly and Adult Services  
129 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
603-271-0547  
603-271-4643  
[dsiress@dhhs.state.nh.us](mailto:dsiress@dhhs.state.nh.us)

**New Jersey**

David Ricci  
Program Development Specialist  
Division of Senior Affairs  
P.O. Box 807  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0807  
609-943-3473  
609-943-3497  
[dricci@dch.state.nj.us](mailto:dricci@dch.state.nj.us)

**New York**

Susan B. Somers  
Assistant  
Bureau of Adult Services  
NYSOCFS  
52 Washington Street

**Minnesota**

Carmen Madden  
Program Manager  
Hennepin County Adult Protection Services  
A-1400 Government Center, 300 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55487  
612-348-6978  
612-348-6076  
[carmen.madden@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:carmen.madden@co.hennepin.mn.us)

**Missouri**

Marta Fontaine  
Aging Program Specialist  
Missouri Division of Senior Services  
615 Howerton Court  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
573-751-3082  
573-751-8493  
[fontain@mail.state.mo.us](mailto:fontain@mail.state.mo.us)

**Montana**

Rick Bartos  
Chief, APS  
DPHHS  
P.O. Box 1051  
Helena, MT 59624  
406-444-9810  
406-444-7743  
[user8829636@aol.com](mailto:user8829636@aol.com)

**Nevada**

Kay Rogney  
Chief Compliance Investigator I  
State of Nevada Division for Aging Services  
Elder Protective Services Unit  
445 Apple Street #104  
Reno, NV 89502  
775-688-2964  
775-688-2969  
[dasreno@govmail.state.nv.us](mailto:dasreno@govmail.state.nv.us)

**Ohio**

William Culver  
County Training Coordinator  
Ohio Department of Job and Family Services  
65 East State Street, 5th Floor  
Columbus, 73200  
614-466-6185  
614-466-6185  
[culver@odjfs.state.oh.us](mailto:culver@odjfs.state.oh.us)

**Oregon 1**

Aileen Kaye  
Abuse Prevention Program Coordinator  
Department of Human Services  
Seniors and people with disabilities  
500 Summer Street, NE  
Salem, OR 97357  
503-945-6399  
503-378-2558  
[aileen.p.Kaye@state.or.us](mailto:aileen.p.Kaye@state.or.us)

**Oregon 2**

Nyla McCarthy  
Training Program Manager  
Office of Investigations and training  
State of Oregon  
2575 Bittern Street, N.E.

Rensselaer, NY  
518-402-6782  
518-474-8572  
[sbsomers@dfa.state.ny.us](mailto:sbsomers@dfa.state.ny.us)

**North Carolina**

Vicki Kryk  
Program Coordinator  
N.C. Division of Social Services  
Adult Family Services  
325 North Salisbury Street, MSC 2405  
Raleigh, NC 27699-2405  
919-733-3818  
919-715-0023

**North Dakota**

Lynne Jacobson  
Elder Rights Administrator  
N.D. Department of Human Services  
600 South 2nd. Street  
Bismarck, ND 58504  
701-328-8910  
701-328-8989  
[sojacl@state.nd.us](mailto:sojacl@state.nd.us)

**South Dakota**

Gail Ferris  
Administrator  
Office of Adult Services and Aging  
700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, SD 57501  
605-773-3656  
605-773-6834  
[gail.ferris@state.sd.us](mailto:gail.ferris@state.sd.us)

**Tennessee**

Sandra Krantz for Marilyn Whalen  
Sr. Training Specialist for Program Director, APS  
Tennessee Department of Human Services  
Adult Protective Services  
Nashville, TN 32248-9700  
615-313-4784  
615-532-9956  
[skrantz@mail.state.tn.us](mailto:skrantz@mail.state.tn.us)

**Texas**

Ann Lindholm  
APS Professional Development Coordinator  
Texa Department of Protective Services  
P.O. Box 149030 (MC:E-561)  
Austin, TX 78714-9030  
512-438-3204  
512-458-4881  
[lindholm@tdprs.state.tx.us](mailto:lindholm@tdprs.state.tx.us)

**Utah**

Elizabeth Talley  
Training Specialist  
State of Utah Adult Protective Services  
120 North 200 West, Suite 325  
Salt Lake City, UT 84103  
801-538-4339  
801-538-4395  
[etalley@hs.state.ut.us](mailto:etalley@hs.state.ut.us)

Salem, OR 97309  
503-947-4221  
503-945-9893

**Pennsylvania**

James Bubb  
Aging Services Specialist  
PA Department of Aging  
555 Walnut Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1919  
717-783-6207  
713-783-6842  
[jbubb@aging.state.pa.us](mailto:jbubb@aging.state.pa.us)

**Rhode Island**

Joyce M. Hall  
Chief Protective Services  
RI Department of Elderly Affairs  
160 Pine Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-222-2858  
401-222-1420

**Vermont**

Vida Lyon  
Program Chief  
Adult Protective Services  
Ladd Hall, 103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 03671-2306  
802-241-3924  
802-241-2358  
[veda@dad.state.vt.us](mailto:veda@dad.state.vt.us)

**Virginia**

Terry A. Smith  
Adult Services Program Manager  
Department of Social Services  
730 East Breed Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-692-1208  
804-692-1215  
[tasd@dss.state.va.us](mailto:tasd@dss.state.va.us)

**Wisconsin**

Jane Raymond  
Advocacy and Protection Systems  
Wisconsin Bureau of Aging and LTC Resources  
P.O. Box 7851  
Madison, WI 53707  
608-266-2568  
608-267-3203  
[ravmoja@dhsf.state.wi.us](mailto:ravmoja@dhsf.state.wi.us)

**Wyoming**

Jan Stiles  
APS Consultant  
Department of Family Services  
Protective Services Division  
Hathaway Building, Third Floor  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
307-777-6137  
307-777-3693  
[jstile@state.wy.us](mailto:jstile@state.wy.us)

## **Appendix - 2**

### **Participating States**

The following states submitted completed surveys.

- |               |                    |                  |
|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Alabama    | 14. Louisiana      | 27. Oregon 1     |
| 2. Arizona    | 15. Maine          | 28. Oregon 2     |
| 3. Arkansas   | 16. Massachusetts  | 29. Pennsylvania |
| 4. California | 17. Minnesota      | 30. Rhode Island |
| 5. Colorado   | 18. Missouri       | 31. South Dakota |
| 6. Florida    | 19. Montana        | 32. Tennessee    |
| 7. Georgia    | 20. Nevada         | 33. Texas        |
| 8. Guam       | 21. New Hampshire  | 34. Utah         |
| 9. Hawaii     | 22. New Jersey     | 35. Vermont      |
| 10. Illinois  | 23. New York       | 36. Virginia     |
| 11. Indiana   | 24. North Carolina | 37. Wisconsin    |
| 12. Iowa      | 25. North Dakota   | 38. Wyoming      |
| 13. Kansas    | 26. Ohio           |                  |

### **Nonparticipating States**

The following states did not submit completed surveys.

1. Alaska
2. Connecticut
3. District of Columbia
4. Kentucky
5. Maryland
6. Michigan
7. Mississippi
8. Nebraska
9. New Mexico
10. North Carolina
11. Oklahoma
12. Puerto Rico
13. South Carolina
14. Washington
15. West Virginia