# **Policy Transmittal Aging and People with Disabilities**



Mike McCormick		<u>Number</u> : APD-PT-19-015				
Authorized signature	е	<u>Issue date</u> : 4/5/2019				
Topic: Protective Services						
Applies to (check all	тпас арргуј.					
☐ All DHS employee	S	County N	lental Health Dire	ctors		
Area Agencies on	Aging: Type B	☐ Health S	ervices			
	with Disabilities	Office of Developmental				
☐ Self Sufficiency Pr	ograms	Disabilities Services (ODDS)				
☐ County DD program	m managers	ODDS Children's Intensive In				
	-	Home Services				
ODDS Children's F	Residential Services	Stabilization and Crisis Unit (SACU)				
☐ Child Welfare Prog	grams	Other (please specify):				
Policy/rule title:	New APS Policy - Structure of APS Investigations in APD-					
	Licensed Facilities					
Policy/rule number(s):	OAR Chapter 411 Divi	sion 020	Release number:			
Effective date:	April 1, 2018	Expiration date:				
References:	OAR 411-020-0000 through OAR 411-020-0130					
Web address:	http://www.dhs.state.o	r.us/policy/spo	d/numeric.htm			
	-					

# **Discussion/interpretation:**

Via this transmittal, APD transmits a new policy related to APD Adult Protective Services (APS) practices.

The new policy, APD-APS-040-004, describes the investigative approach and structure for APS workers to use when investigating reports of abuse in APD-licensed facilities.

A Desk Reference also accompanies this transmittal, providing examples of how the new policy should be applied.

#### **Implementation/transition instructions:**

The attached policy should be considered effective upon being issued.

#### **Training/communication plan:**

The new policy will be posted at the APS Tools intranet site with other APS policies in this series. Communication and discussion regarding this policy will occur during APS Supervisor Meetings, APS Power Hours, and other venues as needed. Requests for technical assistance on applying the new policy should be sent to the APS Policy Unit at <a href="mailto:APSUnit@dhsoha.state.or.us">APD.APSUnit@dhsoha.state.or.us</a>.

#### Local/branch action required:

Ensure local APS staff awareness of new policy and Desk Reference.

#### **Central office action required:**

_						111		
RASNO	na t	a ina	HILLE	regarding	new	NAIIC\/	၁င	needed
rcopc	nia t	UIIIY	unico	regarding	IICVV	policy	as	nccaca.

<u>Field/stakeholder review</u>: ⊠ Yes ☐ No

If yes, reviewed by: APD Policy & Ops

## Filing instructions:

If you have any questions about this policy, contact:

Contact(s): John S. Thompson					
Phone: 503-551-5158 Fax: 503-945-5798					
Email: john.s.thompson@dhsoha.state.or.us					



# DHS Aging & People with Disabilities (APD)

#### **Operational Policy**

Policy title:	Adult Protective Services: Structure of APS Investigations in APD-Licensed Facilities			
Policy number:	APD-APS-040-004			
Original date:	April 1, 2019	Last update:	N/A	
Approved:	Ashley Carson Cottingham, APD Director			

#### **Purpose**

This policy is one of a series intended to provide policy direction regarding Adult Protective Services (APS) practice and documentation in APD and AAA local offices. Application of this policy will help to ensure a consistent statewide response to reports of abuse of adults eligible for APD protective services.

#### **Description**

This policy describes the investigative approach and structure for APS workers to use when investigating reports of abuse in APD-licensed facilities.

#### **Applicability**

This policy applies to all DHS and Type "B" Area Agency on Aging staff providing Adult Protective Services as described in OAR Chapter 411, Division 020, <u>Adult Protective Services – General</u>.

#### **Policy**

 When investigating an allegation of abuse in an APD-licensed facility, APS shall name the licensee as the first Alleged Perpetrator (AP1) in the Facility investigation in CAM, to establish whether negligence on the part of the provider contributed to the reported incident.

- 2. Except in Adult Foster Homes (AFH), "Neglect" should always be the abuse type referenced in the allegation statement for the licensee as AP1. (See #7 below for AFH exception.)
- 3. APS investigation of potential Neglect by AP1/licensee should explore whether facility management should have foreseen, predicted or prevented the alleged action or inaction by facility staff, and whether the facility had appropriate training, supervision and monitoring systems in place to ensure resident safety.
- 4. Any staff member reported or suspected to have committed abuse shall be named as an additional AP (e.g. AP2, AP3, etc.) The individual allegation statement for each staff member shall cite the abuse type they are alleged to have committed.
- 5. If the identity of the staff member involved is unknown, an "unknown" AP2 shall be created in the Facility investigation with an allegation statement citing the abuse type alleged to have occurred. This ensures that the correct abuse types are assigned to the licensee (Neglect) and to the unidentified staff member who committed abuse (Physical, Financial, Sexual, etc.)
- 6. APS investigation of alleged abuse by an Unknown staff AP should explore whether the abuse is more likely than not to have occurred, and whether the perpetrator of the alleged abuse was, more likely than not, a staff member (When/where did the incident occur? Who had access to AV at that time/place? etc.)
- 7. In Adult Foster Homes with a single licensee, when the person alleged to have abused a resident is that licensee, AP1 should be the licensee as listed in the SOQ Provider list (all in CAPS in CAM). Do not create a second allegation or Person Record in CAM for the licensee as an individual, since AFH licensees are listed as individuals. In these cases, the abuse type for AP1 should be the abuse type that was alleged (not necessarily Neglect, as it is in other facility types.)
- 8. In Adult Foster Homes, when the person alleged to have abused a resident is a staff member other than the licensee, the individual licensee will be AP1 (for Neglect) and the individual staff member will be AP2 (for whatever abuse type was reported.)

9. In Adult Foster Homes with two co-licensees, AP1 shall be the co-licensees as listed jointly in the SOQ Provider list (two names in CAPS in CAM). Each co-licensee shall then be named separately, as AP2 and AP3, and investigated for the appropriate abuse type to assess the involvement of each co-licensee separately. If either co-licensee is substantiated individually for abuse, the joint co-licensees (AP1) shall also be substantiated for Neglect. If neither co-licensee is substantiated individually for abuse, then neither should the joint co-licensees (AP1) be substantiated for Neglect.

#### References

• OAR 411-020-0000 through 411-020-0130, Adult Protective Services – General

#### Forms referenced

None.

#### **Related policies**

APD-APS-040-002 - Standard Format for "Allegation Statements"

#### Contact

APD APS Policy Unit APD.APSUnit@dhsoha.state.or.us

### **Policy history**

Established April 1, 2019.

#### Keywords

APS, abuse, adult, investigation, structure, licensed, facility, allegation, statement, AP1, AP2, licensee, neglect, foreseeable, predictable, preventable, unidentified, unknown, staff, perpetrator, individual, co-licensee, foster, home, AFH.

APD-APS-040-004 April 1, 2019

This document can be provided upon request in an alternate format for individuals with disabilities or in a language other than English for people with limited English skills. To request this document in another format or language, contact the Publications and Design Section at 503-378-3486, 7-1-1 for TTY, or email <a href="mailto:dhs-ublicationrequest@state.or.us">dhs-ublicationrequest@state.or.us</a>.

Desk Reference for Structuring AFH Cases in CAM (see APD-APS-040-004)					
License	Scenario	AP Designation	Allegation	Example	
Type			Designation		
Single	Licensee	AP1 = Licensee	Allegation =	Licensee John Doe, on SOQ list as JOHN DOE, is alleged	
Licensee	Alleged to	(all CAPS from	Specific type	to have stolen a resident's medication.	
	Have Abused	Service Provider List	of abuse	JOHN DOE is AP1 with Financial Exploitation as the	
	Resident	in CAM)		Allegation	
Single	Staff of	AP1 = Licensee	AP1 = Neglect	Bob Jones, employee of licensee JOHN DOE, is alleged	
Licensee	Licensee	(all CAPS from	AP2 = Specific	to have stolen a resident's medication.	
	Alleged to	Service Provider list	type of abuse	AP1 = JOHN DOE, with an allegation of Neglect for	
	Have Abused	in CAM)		failing to protect AV from Medication theft by AP2,	
	Resident	AP2 = Staff person		AP2 = Bob Jones, with an allegation of Financial	
				Exploitation.	
Co –	One of the co-	AP1 = Joint Licensees	AP1 = Neglect	Jane Smith, Co-Licensee of AFH licensed to JANE SMITH	
Licensee	licensees	(both names, all	AP2 = Specific	& JOHN DOE, is alleged to have stolen a resident's	
	alleged to	CAPS from Service	type of abuse	medication.	
	have abused	Provider List in CAM)	AP3 = Neglect	AP1 = JANE SMITH & JOHN DOE, with an allegation of	
	resident	AP2 = Licensee		Neglect.	
		alleged to have		AP2 = Jane Smith as an individual, with an allegation of	
		committed abuse, an		Financial Exploitation.	
		individual (may need		AP3 = John Doe as an individual, with an allegation of	
		to create new person record)		Neglect. The investigator should examine whether John reasonably could/should have known that Jane was	
		AP3 = Co-licensee as		stealing medication and/or prevented it from	
		individual (may need		happening.	
		to create new person			
		record)		If either Jane or John are Substantiated for abuse, then	
				the joint license itself (AP1) must also be Substantiated.	
				If neither Jane or John are Substantiated as individuals,	
				then the joint license should not be Substantiated.	

Co-	Staff of co-	AP1 = Joint License	AP1 = Neglect	Bob Jones, employee of AFH licensed by JANE SMITH &
Licensee	licensees	(both names all CAPS	AP2 = Neglect	JOHN DOE, is alleged to have stolen a resident's
	alleged to	from Service	AP3 = Neglect	medication.
	have abused	Provider List in CAM)	AP4 = Specific	AP1 = JANE SMITH & JOHN DOE, with an allegation of
	resident	AP2 = First co-	type of abuse	Neglect
		licensee as an		AP2 = Jane Smith as an individual, with an Allegation of
		individual (may need		Neglect
		to create new person		AP3 = John Doe as an individual, with an Allegation of
		record)		Neglect
		AP3 = Second co-		AP4 = Bob Jones as an individual, with an allegation of
		licensee as an		Financial Exploitation
		individual (may need		
		to create new person		The investigator should examine the extent to which
		record)		either or both licensees could/should have reasonably
		AP4 = Staff person		known that Bob was stealing medication and/or
				prevented it from happening. Perhaps only one licensee
				takes full responsibility for obtaining, setting up,
				monitoring the meds, training staff on medication
				administration, while the other is not involved at all in
				the oversight of this process.
				If either Jane or John are found negligent as individuals,
				then the the joint license itself (AP1) must also be
				Substantiated.