

CDDP Investigators Screening Process Comments/Responses

Comment: Typo on page 3 in 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence. Should be “safety”.

Response: Error corrected in policy transmittal

Comment: Requirement for notification of the CME of a screening decision is not included in the policy transmittal or Screening Guide.

Response: Thank you for your comment and insight. The policy transmittal has been amended to include the required notification of screening outcomes to the CME, guardian, and facility/community program.

Comment: Concern that “Health and Safety” is a higher standard than abuse and neglect.

Response: We appreciate your question and concern. Health and safety is intended to be a lower standard than abuse. In general, reporters will not be familiar with abuse as defined in statute but will be expressing concern for a person’s health or safety. It is the responsibility of the screener to draw out information to assess if the concern being reported can reasonably meet the definition of abuse.

Comment: The abuse definition for I/DD continues to be weak.

Response: The definition of abuse is defined by statute, and we cannot deviate from these definitions unless there is legislation passed to change the law.

Comment: The “No Abuse Concern” portion seems problematic. “The reporter perceives a health or safety concern but does not perceive abuse or neglect, and the AI has no reasonable cause to believe there is a potential of abuse or neglect based on the information gathered.” How is the AI going to be able to make this determination without gathering additional information?

Response: Thanks for your comment and concern. The policy and Screening Guidelines outline the responsibility to gather additional information to make an informed screening decision in determining if there is reasonable cause to believe there is a potential of abuse or neglect. Reasonable cause must be based on the statutory definition of abuse.

Comment: The narrow definitions of abuse and how they are “perceived” and/or reported. It puts the onus on the reporter to persuade the AI as to why they should investigate and how it meets a definition of abuse they may or may not be familiar with.

Response: Thank you for your concern. The intent of the policy is to eliminate the need for reporters to be familiar with statutory abuse definitions and be able to present information based on their perception of a concern. It places responsibility on the AI to gather needed information from the reporter, collateral contacts, and documentation to assess if there is reasonable cause to believe there is potential of abuse or neglect based on the statutory definition of abuse.

Comment: If the AV cannot verbally communicate, communicates nonverbally and/or experiences a barrier to communication, an in-person visit should occur before the report is screened.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. This suggestion is outside the scope of this policy. This policy provides standards and guidelines for the documentation of the screening process. Oregon Administrative Rule 407-045-0295 outlines the need for initial contact with the AV by the end of the next business day of receiving a complaint of alleged abuse. This contact is to assess protective service needs. This initial contact may be conducted by an adult abuse investigator or the case manager and shall be conducted in the least intrusive communication method available. Skills for interviewing individuals who are nonverbal or experience barriers to communication involve critical thinking and competencies best addressed through training and coaching.

Comment: From the flowchart provided not everything will be input into CAM. Every report of possible abuse and/or neglect needs to be input into CAM.

Response: It is accurate that not all “calls” are logged into CAM. The threshold for entry into CAM is that the reporter perceives there is a health or safety concern. Every report of possible abuse or neglect must be input into CAM. The policy directs that reports not entered in CAM are general inquiries that do not involve a reported concern for an individual’s health or safety.

Comment: Comments were received concerning it being difficult to notify police within three days of screening.

Response: This comment is out of scope of this policy. Oregon Revised Statute 430.743 requires notification of law enforcement if there is reason to believe a crime has been committed. Oregon Administrative Rule 407-045-0285 directs that notification of law enforcement happen within one business day if there is reason to believe a crime has been committed.

Comment: Comments were received that capturing protective services in CAM are challenging due to the drop-down boxes.

Response: This comment is out of scope of this policy. Suggestions for refinements and enhancement to CAM can be made to CAM Support for consideration.

Comment: Comments were received that some of the examples in the screening guide were confusing.

Response: The Screening Guide is intended to be a fluid document that can be updated as needed to help guide users. As this document is implemented suggestions for clarification and improvements will be accepted by OTIS. This guide is intended to be a support for users, and it is important OTIS receives feedback concerning gaps.

Comment: Comments were provided suggesting developing stricter guidelines and a checklist so screening can be more consistent across the state.

Response: Thank you for your comments and suggestions. The intent of the screening policy is to communicate guidelines and practices that will

result in more consistent screening outcomes and documentation. Because of the uniqueness of every report and the level of critical thinking required to assess reasonable cause it is difficult to create stricter guidelines and checklists. The guidelines and standards outlined in this policy will provide a means to evaluate practice across the state and identify gaps where more structured guidance can be provided in the future.

Comment: Comments received that some examples concerning evidence were confusing such as video recordings as evidence.

Response: Thank you for your comment and concern. Video recording may be a piece of collateral information available and can be reviewed to assess if there is reasonable cause to believe abuse has occurred. As stated before, this guidance will be reviewed regularly, and further clarification provided as needed.

Comment: Comments were received requesting training to review the screening guidance and suggested it be integrated into Core Comps for consistency.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion and request. OTIS will be providing training on the screening policy and guidelines as part of quarterly meeting. There will also be guidance and coaching available through assigned OTIS abuse investigation coordinators (AIC). The policy transmittal will be incorporated into the OTIS Core Comps training as well as training concerning CAM.

Comment: Suggestion was made to add language to ensure people are respectful of ethnicities and backgrounds when reporting criminal behavior. The language should not state to file for "possible" criminal actions. Should be "probable"

Response: Thank you for your insight and suggestion. The language in the policy has been amended to reflect statutory requirements that states, "If there is reason to believe a crime has been committed". The intent of this policy is to establish standards and provide guidance in the documentation of screening activities.