

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau

Final Report
Hawaii Child and Family Services Review

Final Draft with Executive Summary
October 22, 2003

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Final Report: Hawaii Child and Family Services Review

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of Hawaii. The CFSR was conducted the week of July 14, 2003. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the State child welfare agency – the Hawaii Department of Human Services (DHS);
- The State Data Profile, prepared by the Children’s Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides State child welfare data for the years 1999 through 2001;
- Reviews of 50 cases at three sites throughout the State; and
- Interviews or focus groups (conducted at all three sites and at the State-level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to children, parents, foster parents, all levels of child welfare agency personnel, collaborating agency personnel, service providers, judges and other court personnel, and attorneys.

A key finding of the Hawaii CFSR is that the State is in substantial conformity with one of the seven outcomes assessed through the CFSR – Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs. The findings from the CFSR case reviews and stakeholder interviews indicate that DHS effectively addresses the educational needs of children in foster care and in-home services cases.

Although performance with regard to substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1 (Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect) was higher than it was for Permanency Outcome 1 or Well-Being Outcome 1, the timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment was identified as a serious concern. The case review finding was that an investigation was initiated within the timeframes established by State or local policy in only 52 percent of the applicable cases.

The two weakest areas of State performance on the outcomes occurred for Permanency Outcome 1 (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations) and Well Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs). Case reviewers determined that Permanency Outcome 1 was substantially achieved in only 50 percent of the cases reviewed. Maui cases were more likely to be rated as having substantially achieved Permanency Outcome 1 (67%) than were Oahu (50%) or Hilo (43%) cases. All of the indicators assessed for this outcome were rated as an Area Needing Improvement. In addition, the State did not meet the national standards for (1) the percentage of children re-entering foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode, or (2) the percentage of children experiencing no more than 2 placements during their first 12 months in foster care. Finally, although Hawaii met the national standard for (1) the percentage of reunifications occurring within 12 months of entry into foster care, and (2) the percentage of adoptions finalized within 24 months of entry into foster care, case reviewers found that in a substantial percentage of

the applicable cases reviewed, the agency had not made concerted efforts to either reunify children or finalize adoptions in a timely manner.

Case reviewers determined that only 30 percent of the cases reviewed substantially achieved Well-Being Outcome 1 and all indicators for this outcome were found to be areas in need of improvement. Although performance on this outcome was low in all sites, cases in Maui were more likely to be rated as having substantially achieved this outcome (58%) than were cases in Oahu (30%) or Hilo (17%). A key concern identified pertained to the lack of sufficient contact between caseworkers and the children and parents in their caseloads. The frequency and quality of caseworker contacts with children, for example, was found to be a Strength in only 32 percent of the 50 cases reviewed.

With regard to systemic factors, the State was determined to be in substantial conformity with the factors of Statewide Information System and Agency Responsiveness to the Community. The State did not achieve substantial conformity with the systemic factors of Case Review System; Service Array; Training; Quality Assurance; or Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. With respect to the systemic factor of Case Reviews, the CFSR found that the State was convening permanency hearings and case status reviews in accordance with Federal requirements, and had procedures in place to seek termination of parental rights in accordance with the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). However, the CFSR also found that DHS was not consistent in involving parents in the case planning process or in ensuring that foster parents, adoptive parents, or kin caregivers were notified regarding court hearings and allowed to have input into the case review and permanency hearing process.

The findings with regard to the State's performance on the safety and permanency outcomes are presented in table 1 at the end of the Executive Summary. Findings regarding well-being outcomes are presented in table 2. Table 3 presents the State's performance relative to the national standards, and table 4 provides information pertaining to the State's substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors assessed through the CFSR.

I. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect

Safety Outcome 1 incorporates two indicators. One pertains to the timeliness of initiating a response to a child maltreatment report (item 1) and the other relates to the recurrence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment for the same children (item 2).

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1. This determination was based on the following findings:

- The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 74.0 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for a rating of substantial conformity.
- The State did not meet the national standards for (1) the percentage of children experiencing more than one substantiated or indicated child maltreatment report within a 6-month period, or (2) the percentage of children maltreated while in foster care.

A key finding of the CFSR case reviews was that DHS did not consistently respond to maltreatment reports in accordance with State-established timeframes. In 48 percent of the applicable cases reviewed, DHS did not establish face-to-face contact with the child victim in a timely manner. In addition, in 92 percent of those cases, the maltreatment report was classified as “high risk.”

Although the case reviews did not reveal repeat maltreatment as it is measured for the CFSR case review instrument (item 2), the State’s incidence of maltreatment recurrence (7.2%), as reported in the State Data Profile, did not meet the national standard of 6.1 percent or less.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate

Performance relevant to safety outcome 2 is assessed through 2 indicators. One indicator (item 3) addresses the issue of DHS’ efforts to prevent children’s removal from their homes by providing services to the families that ensure children’s safety while they remain in their homes. The other indicator (item 4) pertains to DHS’ effectiveness in reducing the risk of harm to the child.

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was substantially achieved in 79.6 percent of the cases reviewed, which does not meet the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

Performance with regard to safety outcome 2 varied considerably across the localities included in the onsite CFSR. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 92 percent of Maui cases and 85 percent of Oahu cases, compared to 55 percent of Hilo cases.

A key finding of the CFSR case reviews was that DHS was consistent in providing appropriate services to families to protect children in the home and prevent their removal. However, case reviewers determined that DHS was less consistent in reducing the risk of harm to children. A primary concern identified pertained to the lack of adequate attention on the part of DHS to potential risk factors in the child’s home or during visitation with parents. In some cases, it was the CFSR case reviewers who brought these risk factors to the attention of the caseworkers. Stakeholders attributed this problem to the fact that caseworkers’ caseloads are too high to permit sufficient visitation between caseworkers and children. This issue is addressed further under Well-being Outcome 1, Item 19.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

There are 6 indicators incorporated in the assessment of permanency outcome 1, although not all of them are relevant for all children. The indicators pertain to the agency's effectiveness in preventing foster care re-entry (item 5), ensuring placement stability for children in foster care (item 6), and establishing appropriate permanency goals for children in foster care in a timely manner (item 7). Depending on the child's permanency goal, the remaining indicators focus on the agency's efforts to achieve permanency goals (such as reunification, guardianship, adoption, and permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner (items 8 and 9), or whether the agency is effective in ensuring that children who have other planned living arrangements are in stable placements and adequately prepared for eventual independent living (item 10).

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1. This was based on the following findings:

- The outcome was substantially achieved in 50 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity.
- Fiscal year (FY) 2001 data reported in the State Data Profile indicate that the State did not meet the national standards for the percentage of children who (1) re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode, or (2) experienced no more than 2 placement settings after having been in foster care for 12 months or less.

Although none of the localities included in the onsite CFSR achieved a high level of performance on this outcome, there were differences in performance across sites. Maui cases were more likely to be rated as having substantially achieved Permanency Outcome 1 (67%) than were Oahu (50%) or Hilo (43%) cases.

The case review findings and the State Data Profile suggest that DHS is not consistently effective with regard to (1) preventing re-entry into foster care, (2) ensuring children's placement stability while in foster care, or (3) establishing appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner. In addition, although FY 2001 data in the State Data Profile indicate that Hawaii meets the national standards for the percentage of reunifications occurring within 12 months of the child's entry into foster care and the percentage of adoptions finalized within 24 months of the child's entry into foster care, the findings of the case reviews were that DHS was not consistent in its efforts to achieve these goals in a timely manner. Problems in attaining permanency in a timely manner were attributed to court-related as well as agency-related delays. Court-related delays included the length of time of the TPR appeal process and the tendency of judges to give parents extended periods of time to make the necessary changes to achieve reunification. Agency-related delays involved problems with completing necessary paperwork in a timely manner that were attributed to high caseloads and caseworker turnover.

Permanency Outcome 2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Permanency outcome 2 incorporates six indicators that assess agency performance with regard to (1) placing children in foster care in close proximity to their parents and close relatives (item 11); (2) placing siblings together (item 12); (3) ensuring frequent visitation between children and their parents and siblings in foster care (item 13); (4) preserving connections of children in foster care with extended family, community, cultural heritage, religion, and schools (item 14); (5) seeking relatives as potential placement resources (item 15); and (6) promoting the relationship between children and their parents while the children are in foster care (item 16).

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 69.2 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

Performance with respect to achieving Permanency Outcome 2 varied across localities included in the onsite CFSR. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 86 percent of the Hilo cases, compared to 66 percent of the Maui cases and 61 percent of the Oahu cases.

CFSR findings indicate that DHS makes concerted efforts to place children in close proximity to their families and to place siblings together in foster care. However, case reviewers determined that the agency was not consistent in its efforts to preserve connections between children and their families or to seek and assess relatives as placement resources, although this is mandated in State policy. A key concern identified with regard to this outcome pertained to visitation between children in foster care and their siblings who were also in foster care. Case reviewers determined that DHS makes concerted efforts to place siblings together. However, when siblings are separated, the agency is not consistently effective in ensuring visitation among the siblings. In seven of the nine cases rated as an Area Needing Improvement for this item, reviewers noted that visitation between siblings occurred less frequently than once a month and the agency did not attempt to promote more frequent visitation.

Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Well Being Outcome 1 incorporates four indicators. One pertains to agency efforts to ensure that the service needs of children, parents, and foster parents are assessed and that the necessary services are provided to meet identified needs (item 17). A second indicator assesses agency effectiveness with regard to actively involving parents and children (when appropriate) in the case planning process (item 18). The two remaining indicators examine the frequency and quality of caseworker contacts with the children in their caseloads (item 19) and the children's parents (item 20).

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 30.0 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity.

Although performance with regard to achieving Well-Being Outcome 1 was low in all of the localities included in the onsite review, there was variation across sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 58 percent of the Maui cases, compared to only 30 percent of the Oahu and 17 percent of the Hilo cases.

The CFSR case reviews revealed that DHS was not consistently effective with regard to assessing needs and providing services to children, parents, and foster parents (item 17) or involving children and parents in case planning (item 18). The most significant concern identified, however, pertained to the lack of face-to-face contact between caseworkers and the children in their caseloads (items 19 and 20). In 68 percent of the cases, reviewers determined that the frequency and quality of caseworker contacts with children was not sufficient to ensure their safety or well-being. In all of these cases, contacts with children occurred less frequently than once a month, and in most cases, caseworkers typically made contact with children about once every 3 months. In addition, case reviewers determined that in a substantial percentage of cases, when caseworkers did make contact with children, they did not focus on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery, and goal attainment. A similar concern pertained to caseworker contacts with parents. Stakeholders commenting on the area of caseworker contacts were in general agreement that the frequency of contact with children and parents is insufficient to meet children's needs. Most stakeholders attributed this problem to high caseloads and transportation difficulties.

Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

There is only one indicator for well being outcome 2 and that pertains to agency effectiveness in addressing children's educational needs (item 21).

Hawaii achieved substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2 based on the finding that 89.7 percent of the cases reviewed were determined to have substantially achieved this outcome, which substantively meets the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. A key CFSR finding was that DHS makes concerted efforts to effectively assess children's educational needs and provide appropriate services to meet those needs.

Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

This outcome incorporates two indicators; one assesses agency efforts to meet children’s physical health needs (item 22) and the other assesses agency efforts to address children’s mental health needs (item 23).

Hawaii did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 57.1 percent of the 49 applicable cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome did not vary considerably across locations. Case reviewers determined that the outcome was substantially achieved in 61 percent of Oahu cases, 58 percent of Hilo cases, and 45 percent of Maui cases.

A key CFSR finding is that DHS is not consistently effective in meeting either the physical or mental health needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases. The concerns identified pertained primarily to: (1) a lack of consistent attention to ensuring that children receive regular health screenings and routine preventive medical and dental services, and (2) a lack of accessibility of mental health services resulting in children having mental health service needs that are not being addressed.

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

Statewide Information System

Substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System is determined by whether the State is operating a statewide information system that can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in foster care. Hawaii is in substantial conformity with this factor because the State’s information system meets these requirements.

Case Review System

Five indicators are used to assess the State’s performance with regard to the systemic factor of a Case Review System. The indicators examine the development of case plans and parent involvement in that process (item 25), the consistency of 6-month case reviews (item 26) and 12-month permanency hearings (item 27), the implementation of procedures to seek termination of parental rights (TPR) in accordance with the timeframes established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) (item 28), and the notification and inclusion of foster and pre-adoptive parents and relative caregivers in case reviews and hearings (item 29).

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. CFSR findings indicate that DHS is not consistent in involving parents in the case planning process or in ensuring that foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers are notified of reviews and hearings and given the opportunity to attend reviews/hearings or provide input. However, the CFSR found that case reviews and permanency hearings are held in a timely manner in accordance with Federal requirements, and that the State has a process for seeking TPR that is in accordance with the provisions of ASFA.

Quality Assurance System

The State's performance with regard to the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System is based on whether the State has developed standards to ensure the safety and health of children in foster care (item 30) and whether the State is operating a statewide quality assurance system that evaluates the quality and effectiveness of services and measures program strengths and areas needing improvement (item 31).

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. A key CFSR finding was that despite the rules and standards for health and safety being developed and the existence of various means for monitoring the safety and well being, information from the case reviews and stakeholder interviews suggest that the rules and standards and the methods for monitoring are not uniformly implemented throughout the State. Stakeholders reported that high caseworker caseloads are a major contributing factor in the State's failure to fully implement the rules and standards. However, some stakeholders also attributed failure to fully implement the rules and standards to the lack of consistency with regard to supervisors and/or administrators monitoring cases and caseworker activities.

In addition, most stakeholders expressed the opinion that there is no uniform and consistent Statewide quality assurance system, although there are multiple quality assurance mechanisms that may be implemented at various times and in various localities. Stakeholders stressed that agency units are given discretion regarding the types of quality assurance reviews conducted and that this accounts for some of the fragmentation.

Training

The systemic factor of training incorporates an assessment of the State's new worker training program (item 32), ongoing training efforts for child welfare agency staff (item 33), and training for foster and adoptive parents (item 34).

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of training. The CFSR found that although DHS has a formal initial training program for new employees (social caseworkers, licensing specialists, social service aides, and assistants), many stakeholders

expressed concern about the practicality of the training and the fact that some caseworkers who start work between scheduled training sessions must assume small caseloads before receiving the initial training. In addition, the State does not have a structured ongoing training program for caseworkers or supervisors designed to enhance their knowledge and strengthen their skills. Finally, the CFSR found that training for care givers does not fully prepare general-licensed foster parents to address the intense and myriad array of problems that foster children bring with them, does not provide timely training to child-specific foster homes after the children have been placed, and does not provide or require routine formalized ongoing training.

Service Array

The assessment of the systemic factor of service array addresses three questions: (1) Does the State have in place an array of services to meet the needs of children and families served by the child welfare agency (item 35)? (2) Are these services accessible to families and children throughout the State (item 36)? And (3) Can services be individualized to meet the unique needs of the children and family served by the child welfare agency (item 37)?

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array. The CFSR determined that the State has a broad array of services that DHS either provides or contracts with other agencies to provide, but that there are significant gaps in key services Statewide, particularly therapeutic foster homes and mental health services. In addition, accessibility of particular services varies by island. Finally, the Family Service Plans developed by DHS often do not reflect the family's individualized needs.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The systemic factor of agency responsiveness to the community incorporates the extent of the State's consultation with external stakeholders in developing and implementing the Child and Family Services Plan (items 38 and 39), and the extent to which the State coordinates child welfare services with services or benefits of other Federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population (item 40).

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Information provided in the Statewide Assessment and obtained through the onsite CFSR indicate that the State is highly responsive to input from the community in developing the goals and objectives of the State's Child and Family Services Plan and that the Citizen Review Panel and other community stakeholder recommendations are incorporated in the State's Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR). However, the CFSR also found that there are multiple barriers to coordinating federally-assisted programs to serve children, including lack of communication and collaboration among State agencies.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The assessment of this systemic factor focuses on the State's standards for foster homes and child care institutions (items 41 and 42), the State's compliance with Federal requirements for criminal background checks for foster and adoptive parents (item 43), the State's efforts to recruit foster and adoptive parents that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of foster children (item 44), and the State's activities with regard to using cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate permanent placements for waiting children (item 45).

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Although the CFSR found that the State has established standards for licensing homes that are reasonably in accord with recommended national standards, it was determined that licensing standards are not applied equally to general-licensed foster homes and child-specific foster homes. In addition, the CFSR found that there are problems in recruiting and retaining an adequate number of foster homes that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

Despite these concerns, the CFSR also found that DHS completes the necessary criminal records checks on foster and adoptive homes before placing children in the homes and pursues placing children for adoptions on other islands and the mainland.

Table 1: CFSR Ratings for Safety and Permanency Outcomes and Items for Hawaii

Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome Ratings			Item Ratings		
	<i>In Substantial Conformity?</i>	<i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i>	<i>Met National Standards?</i>	<i>Rating**</i>	<i>Percent Strength</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>
Safety Outcome 1-Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	No	74.0	Both not met			
Item 1: Timeliness of investigations				ANI	52	
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment				ANI	94	No
Safety Outcome 2 - Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate	No	79.6				
Item 3: Services to prevent removal				Strength	89	
Item 4: Risk of harm				ANI	80	
Permanency Outcome 1- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	No	50.0	2 met, 2 not met			
Item 5: Foster care re-entry				ANI	70	No
Item 6: Stability of foster care placements				ANI	77	No
Item 7: Permanency goal for child				ANI	77	
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship and placement with relatives				ANI	60	Yes
Item 9: Adoption				ANI	67	Yes
Item 10: Other planned living arrangement				ANI	75	
Permanency Outcome 2 - The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved	No	69.2				
Item 11: Proximity of placement				Strength	100	
Item 12: Placement with siblings				Strength	86	
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care				ANI	61	
Item 14: Preserving connections				ANI	81	
Item 15: Relative placement				ANI	81	
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents				ANI	70	

*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI)

Table 2. CFSR Ratings for Child and Family Well-Being Outcomes and Items for Hawaii

Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome Ratings		Item Ratings			
	<i>In Substantial Conformity?</i>	<i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>	<i>Rating**</i>	<i>Percent Strength</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>
Well Being Outcome 1 – Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs	No	30.0				
Item 17: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents				ANI	60	
Item 18: Child/family involvement in case planning				ANI	60	
Item 19: Worker visits with child				ANI	32	
Item 20: Worker visits with parents				ANI	35	
Well Being Outcome 2 – Children receive services to meet their educational needs	Yes	89.7				
Item 21: Educational needs of child				Strength	90	
Well Being Outcome 3 – Children receive services to meet their physical and mental health needs are met	No	57.1				
Item 22: Physical health of child				ANI	80	
Item 23: Mental health of child				ANI	54	

*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI)

Table 3: Hawaii's Performance on the Six Outcome Measures for Which National Standards have been Established (2001 data)

Outcome Measure	National Standard	Hawaii Data
Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report in the first 6 months of CY 2001, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period?	6.1% or less	7.2%
Of all children who were in foster care in the first 9 months of CY 2001, what percent experienced maltreatment from foster parents or facility staff members?	.57% or less	.95%
Of all children who entered foster care in FY 2001, what percent were re-entering care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?	8.6% or less	10.0%
Of all children reunified from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care?	76.2% or more	80.3%
Of all children who were adopted from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into foster care?	32.0% or more	51.8%
Of all children in foster care during FY 2001 for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7% or more	83.8%

Table 4: CFSR Ratings for the Seven Systemic Factors and Items for Hawaii

Systemic Factors	In Substantial Conformity?*	Rating
IV. Statewide Information System	Yes (4)	
Item 24: System can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location and goals of children in foster care		Strength
V. Case Review System	No (2)	
Item 25: Process for developing a case plan and for joint case planning with parents		ANI
Item 26: Process for 6-month case reviews		Strength
Item 27: Process for 12-month permanency hearings		Strength
Item 28: Process for seeking TPR in accordance with ASFA		Strength
Item 29: Process for notifying caregivers of reviews and hearings and for opportunity for them to be heard		ANI
VI. Quality Assurance System	No (1)	
Item 30: Standards to ensure quality services and ensure children’s safety and health		ANI
Item 31: Identifiable QA system that evaluates the quality of services and improvements		ANI
VII. Training	No (1)	
Item 32: Provision of initial staff training		ANI
Item 33: Provision of ongoing staff training that addresses the necessary skills and knowledge.		ANI
Item 34: Provision of training for caregivers and adoptive parents that addresses the necessary skills and knowledge		ANI
VIII. Service Array	No (1)	
Item 35: Availability of array of critical services		ANI
Item 36: Accessibility of services across all jurisdictions		ANI
Item 37: Ability to individualize services to meet unique needs		ANI
IX. Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Yes (3)	
Item 38: Engages in ongoing consultation with critical stakeholders in developing the CFSP		Strength
Item 39: Develops annual progress reports in consultation with stakeholders		Strength
Item 40: Coordinates services with other Federal programs		ANI
X. Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention	No (2)	
Item 41: Standards for foster family and child care institutions		Strength
Item 42: Standards are applied equally to all foster family and child care institutions		ANI
Item 43: Conducts necessary criminal background checks		Strength
Item 44: Diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive families that reflect children’s racial and ethnic diversity		ANI
Item 45: Uses cross-jurisdictional resources to find placements		Strength

*Systemic factors are rated on a scale from 1 to 4. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates “Not in Substantial Conformity.” A rating of 3 or 4 indicates Substantial Conformity.

** Individual items may be rated either as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI)

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of Hawaii. The CFSR was conducted the week of July 14, 2003. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the State child welfare agency – the Hawaii Department of Human Services (DHS);
- The State Data Profile, prepared by the Children’s Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides State child welfare data for the years 1999 through 2001;
- Reviews of 50 cases at three sites throughout the State; and
- Interviews or focus groups (conducted at all three sites and at the State-level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to children, parents, foster parents, all levels of child welfare agency personnel, collaborating agency personnel, service providers, judges and other court personnel, and attorneys.

The key characteristics of the 50 cases reviewed are the following:

- Twenty-six cases were reviewed in Oahu, 12 in Maui, and 12 in Hilo. Oahu cases were divided equally (13 and 13) between the urban Honolulu and rural (Leeward) sites.
- All 50 cases had been open cases at some time during the period under review.
- Twenty-six cases were “foster care cases” (cases in which children were in the care and custody of the State child welfare agency and in an out-of-home placement at some time during the period under review), and 24 were “in-home services cases” (cases in which families received services from the child welfare agency while children remained with their families and no child in the family was in out-of-home care during the period under review).
- Of the 26 foster care cases, 17 children (65%) were younger than age 10 at the start of the period under review; 4 children (15%) were at least 10 years old, but not yet 13 years old; and 5 children (19%) were 13 years of age or older at the start of the period under review.
- All of the children in the family were Native Hawaiian in 12 cases and other Asian/Pacific Islander in 11 cases (46%), White in 3 cases (6%), Black in 3 cases (6%), and of 2 or more races in 20 cases (40%). There was 1 case in which the race/ethnicity of the child could not be identified.
- Of the 50 cases reviewed, the **primary** reason for the opening of a child welfare agency case was the following:
 - Physical abuse – 12 cases (24%)
 - Sexual abuse – 11 cases (22%)
 - Substance abuse of parents – 10 cases (20%)
 - Neglect (not including medical neglect) – 8 cases (16%)
 - Abandonment – 3 cases (6%)

- Medical neglect – 2 cases (4%)
- Threat of physical abuse – 2 cases (4%)
- Mental/physical health of child – 1 case (2%)
- Child's behavior – 1 case (2%)
- Of the 50 cases reviewed, the most frequently cited of all reasons for children coming to the attention of the child welfare agency were the following:
 - Substance abuse by parents – 26 cases (52% of all cases)
 - Neglect (not including medical neglect – 24 cases (48% of all cases)
 - Physical abuse – 22 cases (44% of all cases)
 - Domestic violence in child's home – 16 cases (32% of all cases)
- In 13 (50%) of the 26 foster care cases, the children entered foster care prior to the period under review and remained in care during the entire period under review.

The first section of the report presents CFSR findings relevant to the State's performance in achieving specific outcomes for children in the areas of safety, permanency, and well-being. For each outcome, there is a table presenting key findings, a discussion of the State's status with regard to the outcome, and a presentation and discussion of each item (indicator) assessed. For the most part, findings are presented for all three sites taken together, with differences among sites described when they are particularly noteworthy. The second section of the report provides an assessment and discussion of the systemic factors relevant to the child welfare agency's ability to achieve positive outcomes for children.