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- California Social Work Education Center
- The Social Work Workforce for Mental Health
- Mental Health Educational Stipend Program
- Evaluation approaches
- What we’re learning
BEGINNINGS

1991 - California Social Work Education Center started at UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare, focused on strengthening the child welfare workforce. Funded by Title IV-E Federal, State DSS, and matching funds from participating universities.
California Social Welfare Education Center

CalSWEC is the nation’s largest coalition of social work educators and practitioners.

The consortium includes 20 social work graduate schools, county departments of social services or mental health (CWDA and CMHDA), the California Department of Social Services, and the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers

Original purposes:
- Promote the preparation of social workers for employment in public child welfare systems;
- Upgrade the professional background of public welfare workers interested in gaining additional skills and knowledge in child welfare;
- Increase numbers of minorities in professional social welfare positions to reflect the populations served; and
- Open the doors to innovation by integrating university research with county services and graduate social work curriculum development.
MENTAL HEALTH WORKFORCE SHORTAGES

• 2001: Approx. 4 million adults in California needed MH services

• 2004-05: 600,000 clients received county MH services

• 2008: Vacancy rate for MH providers in California = 20-25%, higher in rural areas.
SOCIAL WORK WORKFORCE
TRENDS IN MENTAL HEALTH

• 2000 – 2006: # of social work graduate programs increased from 13 to 17; 2 more are now accredited, 3 more are CSWE accreditation candidates.

• 2006: NASW nat’l study included 349 survey respondents from California. 264 (47%) stated that MH was their area of social work practice.⁴
  ➢ 4.6% working in a psychiatric hospital
  ➢ 9.2% working in an outpatient setting

• 2007: 15,560 LCSWs represent 21.5% of all licensed MH providers in California. Second largest group after MFT’s (37%) ⁵
  ➢ 66% of LCSW’s resided in the Bay Area, Los Angeles, or San Diego regions.
1993 – Mental Health Directors, social work educators, and practitioners began to explore how to create a program, modeled on the Title IV-E program, to prepare more mental health social work professionals with skills to serve the public mental health clientele.

2003 - CalSWEC Board members re-ignited efforts to:

- Develop a curriculum to train graduate students for careers in public mental health services
- Create a partnership between education and provider communities to recruit and deploy more social workers into the mental health system
- Search for resources to support stipends and program development.
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT (PROP. 63) - 2004

Expands mental health services in five program areas:

1. Children’s systems of care;
2. Adult and Older Adult Systems of Care
3. Prevention and early intervention
4. Education and training
5. Innovative programs
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT
WORKFORCE, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING FUNDS GOALS

• Address critical MH workforce shortages
• Retool the existing workforce to create and sustain system transformation
• Create/strengthen career pathways for consumers and family members.
DMH CONTRACT

CalSWEC has received MHSA funding since 2005 for stipends and program activities.

Under current contract (2008-2011), $5.8 million per year is distributed to 17 Schools of Social Work for:

- Stipends ($18,500) for up to 196 second-year students
- Program coordination, and accountability at each school and CalSWEC.

Stipend students have a one-year payback obligation to work in a county or contract mental health agency or to pay the loan back in cash with interest.
MENTAL HEALTH CURRICULUM COMPETENCIES

Foundation and Advanced/Specialization Curriculum Areas

- Cultural and Linguistic Competent Generalist Practice/CLC Advanced MH Practice
- Foundation Social Work Practice/Advanced MH Practice
- Human Behavior and the Social Environment/ Human Behavior and the Mental Health Environment
- Workplace Management/Mental Health Policy, Planning and Administration
CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT

- Five new modules developed in by field and academic faculty:
  - Recovery, Stigma, and Discrimination
  - Co-Occurring Disorders
  - Specialized interventions for Children and Transitional Age Youth with Severe Emotional Disabilities
  - Specialized Interventions with Older Adults
  - Child Welfare and Mental Health Collaboration

- Ongoing technical assistance and training for faculty provided by two consultants.
MHESP PROGRAM EVALUATION

• UC Berkeley SSW Outcome Study:
  - Cohort characteristics
  - Payback obligation performance
  - Post-payback employment

• Loma Linda University, Dept. of SW & Social Ecology:
  - Implementation of the curriculum competencies
  - Preparation of MHESP graduates to work in recovery-oriented mental health systems
EVALUATION METHODS

Outcome study:
Analysis of administrative data
Paper and interview surveys of project coordinators

Curriculum study:
Self-report surveys of schools
Interviews
Focus groups
Survey of graduates
Survey of employment supervisors
# Ethnic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American-Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian-Pacific</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Chicano</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority Students</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to state</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Languages Spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE LANGUAGE GROUPS</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian-Pacific Languages (Tagalog, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Hindi)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Languages (Russian, Italian, Portuguese)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Languages (Ethiopian, Zulu, Swahili)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Duplicative numbers; students speak multiple languages
## Payback Employment: 05 - 08 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORTS</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYMENT RECORD</strong></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. NUMBER OF GRADUATING STUDENTS</td>
<td>174 100</td>
<td>187 100</td>
<td>182 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ENTERED EMPLOYMENT PAYBACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Payback requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Met payback requirement</td>
<td>154 88.5</td>
<td>177 95</td>
<td>171 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dropped out and paid back stipend</td>
<td>20 11.5</td>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Field of Services (completed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Mental Health</td>
<td>154 100</td>
<td>175 99</td>
<td>171 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non Mental Health</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Type of Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Public</td>
<td>98 63.6</td>
<td>90 51</td>
<td>89 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Contracting CBO</td>
<td>56 36.4</td>
<td>87 49</td>
<td>82 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Post-Payback Employment
### 05-08 Cohorts

### EMPLOYMENT PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. TOTAL TRACED</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CURRENT EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employer (Agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The same agency where initially employed</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Different Agency</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Field of Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Mental Health</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non Mental Health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Type of Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Public</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Contracting CBO</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Place of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. California</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Out of state</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSUMERS AND FAMILY MEMBERS

- Little information available about students who are consumers and/or family members
- Appeals process provides some data
- Since 2005, 17 requests for extensions of time were approved:
  - 8 requests due to mental illness.
  - 8 requests for medical reasons
  - 1 request from student who is a consumer and a family member
PARTNERSHIP

CalSWEC = a case study in the benefits and challenges of partnerships among schools and providers
MHESP PARTNERSHIP VISION

To work together to:

- Strengthen the MH workforce in California.
- Create academic and employment environments that support consumers and family members to achieve their educational and career goals
- Take advantage of all opportunities to learn through this grand experiment in system transformation.
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