



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Hawaii

## Final Report

## 2017



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

# Final Report: Hawaii Child and Family Services Review

## INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Hawaii. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Hawaii are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by Hawaii's Department of Human Services (DHS) Social Services Division and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 1, 2017. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 75 cases (46 foster care and 29 in-home) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process in six of the seven Sections—East Oahu, Oahu Special, West Oahu, Kauai, Maui, West Hawaii, and East Hawaii—across the state, between April 1, 2017, and September 30, 2017
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency
  - Attorneys for parents
  - Child welfare agency senior managers
  - Child welfare agency program managers
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers
  - Child welfare agency supervisors
  - Child welfare agency continuous quality improvement (CQI) staff
  - Child welfare agency service providers
  - Service providers
  - Court appointed special advocates (CASA), Guardians Ad Litem, and attorneys for children and youth

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Court system and Court Improvement Program (CIP)
- Foster and adoptive parents, relative caregivers, and representatives from the foster parent association
- Foster and adoptive parent licensing staff
- Judges
- State licensed and approved child care facility staff
- Information systems manager and AFCARS staff
- Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
- Training staff
- Voluntary case management (VCM) case managers
- VCM supervisors
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children’s Bureau suspended the use of the state’s performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state’s performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children’s Bureau will refer to the national standards as “national performance.” This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state’s substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state’s

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Hawaii's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Hawaii's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### Hawaii 2017 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 5 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Quality Assurance System
- Service Array and Resource Development
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

#### Children's Bureau Comments on Hawaii Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Hawaii's overall performance:

The Hawaii child welfare system is built on strong family and community resources, strong partnerships, and the effective involvement of stakeholders. Several systemic factors reviewed in the CFSR were found to be functioning within federal requirements, as noted above. These systemic factors will be the foundation upon which Hawaii plans for ongoing change to improve outcomes for children and families served by the child welfare system. In addition, while Hawaii has experienced an increase in the number of children entering foster care, the strong in-home and up-front services being provided through the state's federal title IV-E waiver demonstration project have allowed some children who would have otherwise come into foster care to remain safely at home.

The CFSR identified cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The Children's Bureau encourages Hawaii, in developing its Program Improvement Plan, to focus on the following key cross-cutting priorities: conducting quality safety assessments, achieving timely permanency for children in foster care, engaging parents in quality caseworker visits, and strengthening the agency and contract case management workforce.

To improve safety assessments and ensure they are of a high quality, Hawaii can build on strong practice identified in these areas: the state initiates and responds to maltreatment allegations in a timely manner; and cases heard in family drug court show better outcomes by providing linkages to services, frequent engagement with parents, residential substance abuse treatment, and wraparound services. The CFSR found that maltreatment allegations concerning children in open cases are not being reported to the hotline in a formal manner; instead, such reports are captured in a "log of concern". Consequently, such allegations are not formally

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

investigated and safety and risk for such cases are not adequately assessed consistently. Some opportunities for the state to increase the effectiveness of safety practice are to formalize the response to maltreatment reports on open cases; strengthen initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments, especially for in-home services cases; integrate information from assessments into case planning; and strengthen caseworker capacity to conduct in-depth and accurate assessments.

To achieve timely permanency for children in foster care, Hawaii can continue to build on strong outcomes in cases where children are placed with relatives. Most of these children experienced stable placements and positive relationships with their parents, and were able to maintain important family and community connections. At times, relative caregivers performed an integral role in the provision of safety plans and helped keep sibling groups together. Further, to support permanency, many cases showed that the state demonstrated sensitivity to cultural norms and continued to re-evaluate relatives for placement throughout the time the child was in foster care. Concerns regarding achieving permanency may be due, in part, to the case review system court processes that support permanency. In some cases, the agency's or court's adherence to the plan of reunification despite parents' lack of progress or engagement in the plan, coupled with hesitancy to move to termination of parental rights (TPR) and adoption if an adoptive resource had not been identified, led to children remaining in care beyond 15 months without a viable goal. Opportunities for the state to improve permanency include thorough assessment and regular review of the child's situation to set an appropriate case plan goal; changing the goal to that which best meets the child's needs in a timely manner; provision of appropriate services to achieve the goal; filing for TPR within required time frames; finalizing adoptions in a timely manner; and increasing the use of concurrent planning.

To improve parental engagement and the quality of caseworker visits, Hawaii can build on stronger well-being outcomes that occur when youth circles and team meetings are held, in-home parenting services are offered, respite is provided, and home-visiting workers are available. The CFSR case review results revealed opportunities for improvement in effectively engaging parents, especially fathers, during quality caseworker visits. The lack of parental engagement significantly affected performance in well-being items related to case planning, caseworker visits, and service provision. The agency had challenges, particularly in in-home services cases, in engaging incarcerated parents, accurately assessing service needs for children and parents on an ongoing basis, and visiting families regularly to assess and address ongoing needs. The challenges in engaging parents coupled with the insufficient quality and frequency of caseworker visits with parents also negatively affected the timely achievement of case plan goals and permanency for children in foster care.

To strengthen the agency and contract case management workforce, Hawaii has the opportunity to build on the foundation of the existing Voluntary Case Management (VCM) contracted in-home service program, which provides a key alternative to traditional child welfare services. The CFSR noted opportunities to improve the program by standardizing the training curriculum for agency and contract case management caseworkers statewide to ensure that all staff are prepared for their positions and understand the goals of the child welfare program. Further, the CFSR identified case closure inconsistencies, especially in VCM cases, and significant caseworker turnover and vacancies in some areas of the state. Hawaii can both improve practice and support accurate caseload and resource distribution by ensuring that cases are closed in a timely manner and solid recruitment and training systems are in place.

## II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Hawaii provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care, in-home, and in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to DHS. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 83% of the 24 applicable cases reviewed.

#### **Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance**

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that reports screened in at the high range of the risk assessment, with a safety concern identified, will have a response of face-to-face contact with the subject of the report preferably within 2 hours but no later than 2 working days of receipt of a report. For reports that fall into the category above and meet criteria identified for imminent removal, the Child Welfare Services Branch (CWSB) responds through the Crisis Response Team (CRT) within 2 hours of the receipt of a report. For reports that are screened in as moderate risk, the Voluntary Case Management (VCM, Hawaii's Differential Response System) program responds within 5 working days of the receipt of a report.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 83% of the 24 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 40% of the 75 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 48% of the 46 foster care cases, 18% of the 17 in-home services cases, and 42% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

#### **Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance**

##### **Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 69% of the 42 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 89% of the 19 applicable foster care cases, 46% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases, and 60% of the 10 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

##### **Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 41% of the 75 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 48% of the 46 foster care cases, 18% of the 17 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.



## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### **State Outcome Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 46 applicable cases reviewed.

### ***Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance***

#### **Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 74% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

#### **Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 69% of the 45 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

#### **Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 50% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 43% of the 46 applicable cases reviewed.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### *Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance*

#### **Item 7. Placement With Siblings**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 80% of the 25 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

#### **Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 36% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 50% of the 12 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 54% of the 35 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 30% of the 23 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

#### **Item 9. Preserving Connections**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 64% of the 44 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 75% of the 44 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 31% of the 35 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 54% of the 35 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 30% of the 23 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

### State Outcome Performance

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% of the 75 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% of the 46 foster care cases, 18% of the 17 in-home services cases, and 42% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### **Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance**

#### **Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 31% of the 74 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 33% of the 46 foster care cases, 19% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases, and 42% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

#### **Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children**

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 72% of the 74 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 78% of the 46 foster care cases, 50% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases, and 75% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

#### **Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents**

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 34% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 27% of the 37 applicable foster care cases, 38% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 51% of the 65 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

- In 33% of the 55 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 64% of the 45 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 41% of the 73 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 40% of the 45 applicable foster care cases, 31% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases, and 58% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 61% of the 44 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 55% of the 65 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 43% of the 47 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 44% of the 75 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 43% of the 46 foster care cases, 24% of the 17 in-home services cases, and 75% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 32% of the 66 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 22% of the 37 applicable foster care cases, 35% of the 17 in-home services cases, and 58% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 36% of the 66 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 35% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

#### State Outcome Performance

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 78% of the 45 applicable cases reviewed.

#### Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

### Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 78% of the 45 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 81% of the 37 applicable foster care cases, 71% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases, and 0% of the 1 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response case.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 46% of the 67 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 46% of the 46 foster care cases, 54% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases, and 38% of the 8 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

#### ***Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance***

##### **Item 17. Physical Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 53% of the 62 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 57% of the 46 foster care cases, 56% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases, and 29% of the 7 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

##### **Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 56% of the 50 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 57% of the 37 applicable foster care cases, 55% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

#### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

##### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

##### *Statewide Information System Item Performance*

##### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state is operating a statewide information system that can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child in foster care.

#### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.



## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### *Case Review System Item Performance*

#### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Hawaii agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that case plans are developed with the involvement of mothers in about half of the cases, and less frequently for fathers.

#### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that the family court conducts periodic reviews for each child at least every 6 months. The state has processes in place to monitor cases to ensure that periodic reviews are held in a timely manner.

#### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that the state has a process in place to ensure that each child in foster care has a permanency hearing no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and at least every 12 months thereafter while in foster care. Statewide data reported in the statewide assessment confirmed that permanency hearings are occurring timely.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions and documenting compelling reasons not to file for TPR are not occurring consistently throughout the state. Stakeholders said that compelling reasons are not defined or documented consistently and that the delay in filing for TPR is partly a result of high caseworker caseloads, caseworker turnover, and a lack of available services for parents. In some jurisdictions, Order to Show Cause hearings delay some cases, while in other areas, cost-saving measures that limit the ability to provide notice by publication for unidentified or absent parents are a barrier for timely filing of TPR petitions for some children.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment. Hawaii agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii reported survey data that showed caseworkers and guardians ad litem inconsistently provide verbal notice of hearings to caregivers and that caregivers are not regularly provided an opportunity to be heard in court hearings.

## Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### ***Quality Assurance System Item Performance***

#### **Item 25. Quality Assurance System**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state has developed and implemented an effective quality assurance (QA) system that includes standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their safety and health. The QA system identifies strengths and needs of service delivery, provides relevant reports, and evaluates implemented improvement measures. Stakeholders confirmed that the state conducts ongoing case reviews using the federal Onsite Review Instrument and Instructions (OSRI), consolidates and analyzes data, develops action plans for change, and monitors progress for consistent quality improvement.

### **Staff and Provider Training**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

#### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Hawaii is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### ***Staff and Provider Training Item Performance***

#### **Item 26. Initial Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders in interviews showed that although the state has a 6-week initial staff training curriculum that alternates 1 week of in-class training with 1 week of on-the-job training, some

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

agency staff are assigned cases before they complete the training. In addition, stakeholders said that VCM provider agencies are contracted to conduct their own training, a practice that creates inconsistencies in skill development throughout the state.

### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii described the state's ongoing training requirements for caseworkers and supervisors. There are a variety of training opportunities available in the community, and tracking mechanisms are in place to ensure that adequate training is received by all staff. Data presented in the statewide assessment showed that most staff and supervisors complete ongoing training and that training is of good quality.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii described the state's initial training requirement for prospective foster parents. The state tracks the completion of that training, but no data are available on training of adoptive parents or staff of state licensed or approved facilities. The training for prospective foster parents is a combination of in-person and DVD at-home training. Stakeholders said that the training is not targeted to the specific needs of care providers, lacks basic information needed to effectively parent the child welfare population, and is not updated to address feedback from trainees. Although the state also requires annual ongoing training, this training lacks targeted content for adoptive parents; foster parents transitioning to adoption; information about the special needs of children with medical, behavioral and mental health concerns; and content related to benefits and resources available to foster families.

---

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### *Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance*

##### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that, although the state provides a comprehensive service array through the child welfare agency, the use of purchase-of-service (POS) contracts, effective coordination with other state departments, and partnerships with community-based providers, the service array is more accessible on Oahu than on neighboring islands. The achievement of case goals such as reunification are delayed due, in part, to a lack of housing resources throughout the state, lack of transportation, and insufficient service availability in therapy and psychological evaluations. Lengthy waiting lists delay the availability of services and the timely achievement of permanency.

##### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state has the capacity to provide individualized services for families and children throughout the state using Ohana conferencing, POS contracts, community-based partnerships, and flexible funding. The state provides culturally, and linguistically appropriate

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

services tailored to the vast diversity of the islands' multicultural population. Although the state has challenges with its service array as reflected in Item 29, there are various protocols and policies in place to prioritize individualizing services.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

##### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state engages in ongoing consultation with a broad array of key internal and external stakeholders and is effective in soliciting their input with regard to the agency's overall goals and objectives. The state is responsive to stakeholder recommendations and integrates the input into goals, objectives, and annual updates.

##### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii showed that the state effectively coordinates services delivered under the CFSP with services provided by other federal programs serving the same population. The agency's partners include the Departments of Health and Education, MedQuest, Court Improvement Project, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Hawaii is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Three of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### *Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance*

##### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii reported that the state holds non-relative and relative foster care providers (child-specific) to the same licensure standards. Stakeholders said that although waivers for non-safety requirements are available to families issued child-specific licenses, the same home-study and training requirements apply to both types of homes.

##### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment. Hawaii agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that, although the state requires criminal background clearances for foster and adoptive families before placement and obtains fingerprint clearances before licensure, the state does not have procedures to ensure statewide compliance with criminal background check requirements and has no means to gather and report related data.

## Hawaii 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii described the statewide diligent recruitment efforts. These efforts include regular and ongoing review and analysis of the state's population and frequent adjustment to recruitment activities to ensure the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of the children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

### Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Hawaii received an overall rating of Strength for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Hawaii described its process that effectively ensures cross-jurisdictional resources are used to facilitate timely adoptive and permanent placements for waiting children. Stakeholders confirmed that in-state, cross-jurisdictional resources are used to facilitate permanent placements for children. The state provided data to demonstrate that almost all home studies requested from other states were completed timely.



## Appendix A

### Summary of Hawaii 2017 Child and Family Services Review Performance

#### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% 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.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	83% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	40% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	41% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	35% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	74% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	50% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	43% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	36% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	64% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	31% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	28% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	31% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	34% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	64% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	41% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	44% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	32% Strength

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	78% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	46% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	56% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Case Review System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Staff and Provider Training</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Service Array and Resource Development</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>7</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	5.7%	4.5%–7.2%	FY14–FY15
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	7.49	5.16–10.87	15A–15B, FY15

<sup>7</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

## Appendix A: Summary of Hawaii 2017 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	48.8%	45.3%–52.4%	13B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	40.5%	35.8%–45.3%	15B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	33.9%	29.7%–38.2%	15B–16A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	14.2%	10.8%–18.6%	13B–16A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.35	3.07–3.66	15B–16A

\* Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP) is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

\*\* 95% Confidence Interval is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

\*\*\* Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1–September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1–March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1–September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.



## Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Hawaii 2009 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CFSR in Hawaii in 2009. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 9
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> June 1–5, 2009
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2008, through June 5, 2009
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> August 24, 2009
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> November 23, 2009
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> January 1, 2011

### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The state met the national standards for <b>four</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>none</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>five</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: Hawaii 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	97.8	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.49	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	120.4	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	112.5	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	123.5	Meets Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	102.4	Meets Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Hawaii 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Hawaii 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
2. Repeat Maltreatment	Strength
Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Not Applicable
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B: Hawaii 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### **Systemic Factors**

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
24. Statewide Information System	Strength
25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Area Needing Improvement
35. Array of Services	Strength
36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
37. Individualizing Services	Strength
38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength

## Appendix B: Hawaii 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength