

2002 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MAUI CITIZEN'S REVIEW PANEL

I. Review of 2001 Recommendations:

- a. The STATE OF HAWAII should fund and staff regular monthly County CRP meetings.

As of April, 2002, the State of Hawaii provided staff and transportation to monthly Maui CRP meetings. This step resolved technical problems with Lanai and Molokai video conferencing and facilitated the CRP's work with DHS senior staff. The Maui CRP thanks DHS for its commitment to the work of the CRP volunteer committee members.

- b. The State of Hawaii should fund and staff quarterly statewide CRP meetings.

In 2002, none of the County CRPs requested a statewide meeting and none were held. Susan Chandler, outgoing DHS director, met with the Maui CRP in September, 2002, as did her deputy Elizabeth Kent, earlier in the year. Both expressed a preference that County panels select issues of importance in their own County and focus on those issues. Some CRP members continue to feel that without coordinated statewide efforts, the CRP may diminish their effectiveness.

- c. The State of Hawaii should address chronic staff shortages and caseload issues, by:

- 1) developing a relationship with the UH MSW program to design and create a practicum to regularly employ graduate students and
- 2) by prioritizing recruitment and retention with appropriate pay and staff.

Maui CRP did not review this issue in 2002 but intends to do so in 2003.

- d. The State of Hawaii should develop more departmental memorandums of agreement to facilitate fieldwork at all levels, and should meet monthly at supervisory levels to improve that work.

Maui CRP did not explore this issue in 2002. We intend to pursue the issue in 2003.

- e. Continue to improve the report and analysis of Federal Outcome Measures by increasing fund for computer hardware and software.

1. Frequency of reporting

Over the past two fiscal years, the Maui CRP has been provided, at a minimum, quarterly reports on the Federal Outcome Measures. Occasionally, the Maui CRP has received additional quarterly reports by islands (Maui, Molokai and Lanai). The Maui CRP has also received reports comparing the Maui section to the different sections throughout the state.

2. Adequacy of data being reported

The Maui CRP has been pleased with the adequacy of the data being reported. The explanations for each outcome measure is consistent and easy to understand. Most importantly, the data is in concert with the Maui CRP's 2000 recommendation of using the Federal Outcome Measures as a way to assess the efficacy of the Maui Section CWS.

3. Hardware and software improvements

Without specific reports to the contrary, the submission of the quarterly Federal Outcome Measure reports to the Maui CRP serves as evidence of the improvements in DHS' computer hardware and software systems.

II. Maui CRP's 2002 Focus:

a. Federal Outcome Measure monitoring:

Refer to the attached matrix outlining the outcomes for FY 02 & FY 03

1. Reduce the recurrence of Child Abuse and Neglect ("CAN")

In the last two fiscal years, ending in June of 2002, the Maui Section met the federal standard 4 of the 8 quarters. The last two quarters of FY 03 deviated from the previous six quarters where the figures hovered around or were below the national standard.

Maui was one of four sections that did not meet the standard in FY 03, primarily due to the spike in the last quarter of FY 03.

2. Reduce the incidence of CAN in foster care

The Maui section met the national standard in 7 of the 8 quarters in the last two FY.

The Maui section was one of four sections in the state that met the national standards for both FY.

3. Increase permanency of children in foster care

There is no federal standard for this outcome measure.

The Maui section established good permanency, reunification and emancipation rates.

There were no section-by-section comparisons for this outcome measure.

4. Reduce time in foster care to reunification without increasing re-entry

The Maui section met reunification standards in 7 of the 8 quarters during the last two FY. In comparison, the Maui section was only one of four sections that met the standard for both FY.

In contrast, Maui section's re-entry rate was very poor. They met the national standard only 1 of 8 quarters. It is hypothesized by the Maui CRP that there is a correlation between this poor showing and the section's high reunification rate. It is yet to be established that it is a causal relationship.

Likewise, none of the sections met the standard for both FY-only two sections met the standard for FY 02. Observations indicate many reunifications occur too soon and result in high re-entry rates.

5. Reduce time in foster care to adoption

The Maui section was successful in meeting the national standard in both FY.

They were one of five sections in the state that met the national standards in both FY.

6. Increase placement stability

The Maui section was unable to meet the national standards in any of the reporting quarters for FY 02 and 03.

Likewise, none of the other sections were able to meet the national standards for either of the FY.

b. Purchase of Service contracts

In 2001, the Maui CRP learned that a large contract was awarded to a single provider to provide both comprehensive services as well as “diversion” services in Maui county. After a good start, the contractor experienced complaints which CWS ultimately resolved by intervening with the contractor together with its federal contract monitor office.

In 2001 the Maui CRP asked how the Diversion contract could be shown to have worked. What objective measurements were in place? In 2001, the contractor did not have access to the State of Hawaii data to show how many low or moderate cases which received Diversion service, came back into the system.

In 2002, Maui CRP interviewed Personal Parenting, the diversion and comprehensive service provider for Maui county in 2001-2. We also interviewed David Boerner, who is head of the State of Hawaii federal contract monitor office on Oahu. Finally, we interviewed CWS senior staff and supervisors.

The 2002 report from the Diversion contractor, attached hereto, begins to show how many low moderate cases enter the CWS system, after Diversion services. The CRP is not aware of any base line for measuring the number of low moderate cases which develop into a high risk case over the six month period measured.

CWS rates the program as a success on the premise that without a diversion contract there is no service or intervention whatsoever in low moderate cases, given budget and case load realities. Experienced CRP volunteers express the following concerns:

1. The program should require completion of the 3-6 week service plan, not best efforts.
2. It is a big expensive contract without a demonstrated track record of success known to the CRP.

Social workers and CRP members on Lanai and Molokai rate the system as “poor” because there is no visible regular presence and services are difficult to obtain or non-existent. Travel to Maui is a real barrier for working families and it took too long to resolve the problems. These social workers want:

1. A full time office on Lanai and Molokai (visible and accessible)
2. A full time Maui contract monitor.
3. Longer contracts to allow for stable staffing and budgeting.

III. Conclusions/Overview of Maui CWS:

a. Is CWS doing what it is mandated to do?

The Federal Outcome Measures objectively compare Hawaii’s CWS with national and state wide outcomes. This allows managers to identify problems and to set standards by which to manage cases. This is a good start.

Maui CWS seems to enjoys greater statistical and anecdotal success and/or fewer challenges that its

urban and rural cousins. Problems linger in rural island communities with delivery of services needed to re-unify families.

b. Is CWS meeting the Federal Outcome Measures?

Maui CWS met three of six federal outcome measures.

c. CWS strengths/progress made

Maui and State of Hawaii CWS improved its reporting system.

d. CWS weaknesses/areas in need of improvement

Opinions differ on the quality of Purchase of Service contracts and the system designed to enforce compliance. As above, the rural areas find this to be an on-going source of concern.

IV. Recommendations:

In 2003, the Maui CRP plans to review:

A. Development of high level memorandums of understanding between department of health, education and human services and legal representation in Family Court. Maui CRP has already heard of both high and low level interdepartmental conflict, especially with special needs children and/or therapeutic fosters homes.

B. Maui CRP will continue to watch the purchase of service system and the ability of the STATE OF HAWAII to monitor and enforce compliance.

C. The lack of therapeutic foster homes and rising number of children with serious needs for whom there is no placement in Hawaii.

D. Worker caseloads and vacancy rates.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Caparida
Frank Freda
Butch Gima
Elizabeth A. Ivey
Frances Joswick
Irene Laemona
Lyn McNeff