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NCCD promotes just and equitable social systems for individuals, families, and communities through research, public policy, and practice.
SDM® Principles

Reliability

Validity

Equity

Utility

Efficacy
Promote safety
Identify needs
Reduce harm
Adult Protective Services Projects

- California
  - Riverside County
  - San Diego County
  - Orange County
  - Yolo County
  - San Luis Obispo County

- New Hampshire

- Minnesota

- Norfolk, Virginia

- Nebraska

- Texas

- National projects
  - National Institute of Justice grant
  - National Adult Protective Services Resource Center partnership
Objectives

Provide workers with simple, objective, reliable assessment tools to support their decisions.

Increase consistency and accuracy in decision making.

Provide managers and administrators with management information for improved program planning, evaluation, and resource allocation.
Why structure decisions?
How Structured Tools Are Helpful

All possible information that can be known

Information we learn during the investigation/assessment

Information needed to make the decision at hand
The SDM® Model as Part of a Broader, Client-Centered Practice Framework

- Assessments do not make decisions... people do.

- Research and structured assessments can help guide and support decision making to improve outcomes.

- The SDM® model should be integrated within a context of client engagement strategies and strong social work practice approaches.
NAPSA Program Standards
(Adopted by NAPSA Board in October 2013)
Why Have Program Standards?

- Adults have the right to be safe.
- Adults have the right to retain their civil and constitutional rights.
- Adults have the right to make decisions on their own, including the right to accept or refuse services.

Source: NAPSA APS Recommended Minimum Program Standards, October 2013, page 5
What Does Best Practice Look Like?
Best practice should be:

- Coordinated
- Have a guiding set of principles, with specific policies and procedures
- Evidence-based
- A system that captures and aggregates data to inform decisions at all levels of the agency
- Unbiased—does not discriminate
The SDM® Assessments

- **Intake**
  - Screening criteria
  - Response priority

- **Safety**
  - Current/immediate harm
  - At initial in-person contact

- **Risk**
  - Likelihood of future harm
  - At end of investigation

- **Strengths and Needs**
  - Comprehensive assessment of functioning
  - Focuses service planning
Inter-Rater Reliability: Consistency

- Basis for consistency: Definitions and training
- Inter-rater reliability: Testing to see the extent to which multiple raters agree
- Inter-rater reliability results:
  - < 75% agreement
  - > 75% agreement
Meeting or Exceeding NAPSA Standards Through Use of the SDM® System

Putting the pieces together
NAPSA’s Core Activities

- Intake
- Investigation
- Needs and risk assessment
- Case findings
- Service planning and monitoring
- Case closure
Standard for Intake

APS programs have a systematic method, means, and ability to promptly receive and screen reports of abuse, neglect, self-neglect, and/or financial exploitation.

Source: NAPSA APS Recommended Minimum Program Standards, October 2013, page 6
The SDM® Intake Assessment

Components

- Determination of eligibility
- Allegations criteria
- Overrides
- Screening decision

Screening assessment: Do we investigate?

Response priority: How quickly?
Standard for Investigation

APS programs have a systematic method, means, and ability to conduct and complete an investigation in a timely and efficient manner, to determine if the reported abuse has occurred, and to determine if services are needed to reduce or eliminate the risk of abuse, neglect, self-neglect, or exploitation of a vulnerable adult.
How the Investigation Process is Operationalized in the SDM® System

SDM system: Different tools used to help workers with critical decisions during the investigation

- Safety assessment: At first face-to-face contact
- Risk of recidivism assessment: Prior to closing the investigation
- Strengths and needs assessment: Prior to closing the investigation

Together, these meet the NAPSA standards for investigation.

Note: The SDM tools are not meant to be used as substantiation decision-making tools themselves. However, information gathered during the course of the investigation using the SDM tools can inform the substantiation decision.
The SDM® Safety Assessment

Components

- Factors influencing vulnerability
- Current danger factors
- Interventions
- Safety decision

Is there a current threat of serious harm to the alleged victim?

What interventions are recommended to address threats to safety?

Based on client and caregiver acceptance of interventions, what is the safety decision?
The SDM® Risk of Recidivism Assessment

Components

- Self-neglect index
- Maltreatment by another person index
- Scored risk level
- Overrides

What is the likelihood of future harm?

Should ongoing intervention services be provided?

What level of service/engagement is required?
What is actuarial risk research?
Sample period: March 2009 to September 2009

Six-month standardized follow-up period: September 2009 to March 2010

Outcomes: investigation and substantiation
Development of Risk Indices

- Look at the relationship of all possible risk factors to the self-neglect or abuse/neglect outcomes.

- Select the characteristics with the strongest statistical relationship to each outcome (self-neglect and mistreatment by another person).

- The result is one score for self-neglect and one score for abuse/neglect by another person.

- Defined cut points translate these scores into risk classifications (low, moderate, high).

- The higher of the two risk classifications becomes the overall risk level.
Overall Outcomes by Overall Risk Level

Investigation Substantiation

National Institute of Justice grant 2008-IJ-CX-0025

N = 763; base rate, investigation = 10.1%; base rate, substantiation = 5.2%.
Overall Risk Level Distribution

- Low: 248 (32.5%)
- Moderate: 406 (53.2%)
- High: 109 (14.3%)

N = 763

National Institute of Justice grant 2008-IJ-CX-0025
Limitations of Actuarial Risk Assessment
Use Of The Term “Risk”
Standard for Needs and Risk Assessment

APS programs have in place a systematic screening method, means, and ability to conduct and complete a needs/risk assessment including clients’ strengths and weaknesses. This assessment needs to include criticality or safety of the client in all the significant domains.

Source: NAPSA APS Recommended Minimum Program Standards, October 2013, pages 10-11

Please note: unless specifically qualified or authorized by state law, an APS worker does not carry out clinical health or capacity assessments, but rather screens for indications of impairment and refers the client on to qualified professionals (physicians, neuropsychologists, etc.) to administer through evaluations.
The SDM® Strengths and Needs Assessment

Components
- Client domains
- Caregiver domains
- Prioritization

What priority needs should be addressed in service planning?

What existing strengths can be used to address those needs?
Case Findings, Service Planning and Monitoring, Case Closure and Documentation
The Full SDM® System

- **Intake**
  - Screening criteria
  - Response priority

- **Safety**
  - Current/immediate harm
  - At initial in-person contact

- **Risk**
  - Likelihood of future harm
  - At end of investigation

- **Strengths and Needs**
  - Comprehensive assessment of functioning
  - Focuses service planning
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