

MEETING MINUTES

LCSW Education Committee May 5, 2008

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 N. Market Blvd.
Hearing Room, First Floor
Sacramento, CA 95834

Committee Members Present:

Renee Lonner, LCSW Member, Chair
Gordonna DiGiorgio, Public Member
Joan Walmsley, LCSW Member

Staff Present:

Paul Riches, Executive Officer
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer
Christy Berger, MHSA Coordinator
Sean O'Connor, Outreach Coordinator
Kristy Schieldge, Staff Counsel
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

Committee Members Absent:

None

Guest List:

On File

Renee Lonner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

I. **Introductions**

The Committee introduced themselves in place of roll. A quorum was established. Staff and audience members also introduced themselves.

II. **Purpose of the Committee**

Ms. Lonner explained that the LCSW Education Committee (Committee) will be looking at the landscape in terms of how Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSWs) are prepared to face today's workplace which includes many different types of settings. In terms of education, the Committee is concerned with those MSWs who are interested in obtaining a clinical license. The first question is what do LCSWs need as an educational foundation in order to be able to land on their feet in this complex environment and in workplaces where the level of demand is typically very high. We need to look at the core competencies required for licensed independent practice.

The Committee's role is information gathering and data collecting, and the Committee hopes for a great deal of feedback from stakeholders. This is an open-ended inquiry, and

the Committee does not know where it will lead. This process will take many months, and the Committee will travel around the state and talk with people. Ms. Lonner expressed her appreciation to all of those who took the time to attend the meeting.

III. Review of Information Sources and Key Stakeholders

Christy Berger listed the sources of information and key stakeholders that staff and the Committee members have identified. Ms. Berger asked audience members to provide additional sources of information.

Janlee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) California Division, pointed out that it would be helpful to understand the distinction between social work as a vocation versus social work as a profession. He suggested some informational sources: the NASW clinical standards, the NASW code of ethics, and NASW statistics and demographics that are on its website under the Center for Workforce Studies. He pointed out that because California only has one license it has become the catchall license, and it is being used by the outside world in many different ways. He knows the Board can't control that but it does affect social work education and the public's perception of what social workers do. He applauded the Committee for its effort for taking this on because it will be a chance to describe and talk about the full breadth of social work.

Paul Riches stated that we should obtain some job descriptions from around the state that carry the social worker title and require the LCSW license. This will give the Committee and staff a better idea of which workplaces and settings require the license.

Ms. Walmsley asked if there was any title protection for social workers. She believes this is hugely impacting the profession. She doesn't know if it is appropriate for this Committee to address, but it is a valid issue.

Mr. Riches stated that he received additional feedback on data sources, and asked others for suggestions on identifying other stakeholders and to provide that information.

IV. Review of LCSW Occupational Analysis

Ms. Berger explained that an occupational analysis is a method a method for identifying the tasks performed in a profession or on a job and the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to perform that job safely and competently. It provides a comprehensive description of current practice, and is a snapshot in time. The results of an occupational analysis are used to form the basis of an examination program. It is used in other ways also, and there is a lot of information the Committee can take from it.

Ms. Berger explained that the most recent LCSW occupational analysis was performed in 2004, and that the Board contracts with the Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Examination Resources (OER) to perform the analysis. The analysis involves interviewing and surveying LCSWs who are working in different practice settings and different parts of the state to obtain information and survey them about what they do. The results of the analysis are used to form the LCSW examination outline.

Mr. Riches stated that one of the central issues is that occupational analyses are evolutionary documents, fundamentally grounded in what came before them, that is, there is a baseline they work from. There may be a significant disjuncture due to intervening events such as MHSA and changes in funding and programmatic structure. Given this

occupational analysis, absent any input this is the blueprint as it relates to licensed practice about the totality of knowledge we expect from our licensees: 1) Does it still make sense? 2) Are there big things we're missing? 3) How does this address the actual workplace as it relates to doing clinical social work in California? We are hoping for some feedback on that because it is a starting place for the Committee's work.

Mr. Wong referred to the demographic data in the occupational analysis. He stated that statistics on the incoming social workers show that whites are a minority and will be so increasingly. The occupational analysis is done on a random sample, and it is developed to try to be inclusive to minority groups. But there is a gap between the incoming social workers and the licensees who get surveyed. It is important because those new social workers will be taking the exam and will be culturally different than those who were surveyed for the analysis. This may impact who passes and who fails the exam. If we have a whole new population of social workers who are very ethnically diverse, how is that accounted for in the sampling of persons to receive the survey?

Inna Tysoe from the Department of Mental Health asked when the current exam was constructed. Mr. Riches responded that the occupational analysis resulted in a content outline that is the basis for all of the examinations, and this was last done in 2003. The Board develops two new forms of the examination each year based on that same content outline.

Heather Halperin from the University of Southern California's (USC) School of Social Work stated that she noticed that the examination outline seems to lack the influence of culture and the tremendous movement toward evidence-based practice. So there are interventions included but they are not based on theoretical knowledge.

Mr. Riches summarized the issues raised that the committee should include on future agendas: the influence of culture, bringing someone in to speak on evidence based practices, and demographics in occupational analyses (historically and what projections might look like). The Board is at a point of opportunity where it will conduct the next occupational analysis in about 18 months so if there are gaps we can work with OER to address those gaps.

Mr. Wong suggested bringing in presenters on recovery-oriented practice. He suggested that they prepare by looking at the occupational analysis and content areas and commenting on what fits and what doesn't fit that type of practice. Ms. Lonner responded that recovery oriented care is a huge effort going on all over the country. Mr. Riches stated that the California Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies (CASRA) and the National Mental Health Association of Los Angeles have provided great information in the past but the Committee and staff are open to other ideas.

Mr. Wong stated that the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) have some consultants, speakers and presenters on this subject, and they often come to California. He offered to contact Mr. Riches the next time they come to California. This is a national movement, and it is being recommended by the federal government. While we have good experts in California, it would be interesting to hear about it from a federal level. Mr. Riches asked if anyone has a contact at SAMHSA. Geri Esposito, Executive Director of the California Society for Clinical Social Work (CSCSW), stated she would check.

Mr. Lonner stated that mental illness is debilitating and recently read an article stating that it is second only to cardiovascular disease in terms of how debilitating it is.

Mr. Wong suggested we involve the Veterans Administration and military, because there are a huge number of injured soldiers. The VA is a federal agency so their standards require social workers to have taken the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) examination. It would be important to get their perspective on what kind of training LCSWs should get and what examinations they should take. These are key agencies that we would benefit a lot from involving in this process.

Mr. Riches asked about bringing in someone to talk about trauma and disaster response, as the government is looking for licensees to perform that kind of work. It would be worth giving some attention to because it is basic to public protection. He asked if someone could provide information on who to contact for more information. Mr. Wong suggested that we also address school violence, related yet a little different because it is on a campus. He stated he would email Mr. Riches with some contact information.

Ms. Walmsley suggested looking at medical social work. She may know someone, and asked Ms. Halperin if she knows anyone. Ms. Halperin stated that she knows Sharon Massey from Cedars Sinai and June Simmons from Huntington Hospital. She also suggested Marlene Wong, who does disaster work nationwide and in Los Angeles schools, and Ron Aster from USC who would be a resource on school violence.

Ms. Esposito stated that one of their members, Lou Monet, was hired by the military and he debriefs troops coming back from Middle East. He may be a good first-person speaker about this topic. She believes it is good to have organizational overviews, but it is better to hear from the individuals actively doing the work when possible because they can talk about their learning curve, and how easy or hard it was to adapt to these settings. Ms. Lonner stated that she knows someone who works with military families that may be of assistance.

Mr. Wong stated that the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is trying to forecast their need for social workers and are doing a lot of recruiting. The parallel agency is the state Department of Mental Health, and they have a lot of forensic facilities. Key people could be the chiefs of social work at each of these institutions. This is so important because they are actively seeking out new young social workers, and we need to know how well these social workers prepared for these types of agencies.

Ms. Walmsley stated that she and Ms. Lonner have both practiced in many different types of settings and would be able to help provide that perspective. Ms. Lonner stated that one of the unique things about social work is the variety of work settings, and the person in the environment perspective.

VI. Future Meeting Dates

This agenda item was taken before the presentation from the California State University at Sacramento (CSUS) in order to allow time for the guest presenter to arrive, since the prior topics finished early.

The next two meetings will be held on June 30 and September 15, 2008. The Board is trying to find locations that are accessible and will maximize participation, and would like to meet at schools, but the logistics can be complicated.

Ms. Halperin stated that she may be able to help, and suggested holding meetings at USC or Hebrew Union College. An audience member suggested the Center for Child Welfare.

Mr. Riches stated that we want to encourage participation but know that summer months are absent of faculty and the student base. Ms. Halperin stated that September can be difficult for schools also. Mr. Riches asked for any other suggestions for locations. Charlene Gonzalez suggested the California Endowment in Los Angeles; it may be available at no cost.

Mr. Riches asked Ms. Jensen if there would be meeting space available at CSU Chico. Ms. Jensen responded yes, but cautioned that it is not the most accessible as far as flying. Mr. Riches stated that we would keep Chico in mind.

Mr. Wong suggested meeting at The Village in Long Beach, the program that is nationally known for their use of the recovery model. Mr. Riches stated that the Board hopes to visit The Village, possibly in conjunction with our November board meeting, as it would be highly educational.

Ms. Lonner received a special request to change June meeting from 30th to 23rd, which the committee agreed to do.

V. Presentation about Graduate Social Work Education from the California State University at Sacramento, Division of Social Work

Mr. Riches introduced Dr. Robin Carter, Director of the Division of Social Work at California State University of Sacramento (CSUS). Dr. Carter provided some background about the national accrediting standards for social work education from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), and handed out a copy of the accrediting standards. She stated that the standards provide some sense of how programs are structured, but to get a better sense you would have to look at individual programs. Accreditation is required for any school that wants the degree to be transferable, qualify for licensure, and be credible. There have been some revisions in the policy standards, which may have been released recently, but they are not radically different. All of the current programs are based on this version of the accreditation standards.

She explained that accreditation is important because the Board focuses on consumer protection, and there are many elements of accreditation that are in line with consumer protection. It is not just about designing content, and there are a lot of requirements that help promote quality programs.

Dr. Carter referred to page six which talks about the structure of social work education. Each program has a different mission and is designed around that mission and its particular objectives. Programs can be very different. Mr. Riches asked in terms of formulating a mission, do schools consider the regional needs, or are there some that have a national focus? Dr. Carter stated that the programs in urban areas, for example, would typically have part of their mission as serving that community. Some programs are much more focused on preparing people for a certain kind of social work. CSWE requires the content of the curriculum to reflect the mission and objectives. CSUS advises students who are looking for a program to think about the type of social work they want to do or what community they want to serve to help them make that decision.

Mr. Riches asked when formulating a mission is that something that the faculty does or is it from the school on a larger basis. Dr. Carter responded that it tends to be layered, the universities have a broad mission and her program is under a college, but some are standalone schools of social work. For CSUS, the university has a mission, the college

has a mission and the program has a mission. The mission is formulated by the faculty. She stated that CSUS is going through a reaffirmation of their accreditation, which has to be done every eight years. It takes about two years to prepare for reaffirmation.

Dr. Carter next referred the committee to page seven which states that all programs must have a professional foundation, which basically means in order for a program to have transferability or uniformity across the degree, there are certain things every program must contain. This speaks to the objectives of the foundation curriculum content, what must come first in the graduate program and the concentration curriculum and objectives.

She next referred to the bottom of page eight, which states that the foundation curriculum must have the following content: values and ethics, diversity, populations at risk, social work practice/theory, social welfare policy and services, research and field education. This content must be completed before moving on to the advanced curriculum. The foundation curriculum will look pretty much the same across MSW programs although some may have a different number of classes or the course names might be different but they all must have this content.

Dr. Carter continued to explain about the advanced content in the second year, which is where the concentration content is delivered. She explained that in general, all of the programs are set up this way. Some deliver the program in two years and some in four years for part time students. The programs tend to require about 60 units.

The advanced concentration content is not specified in the CSWE standards, and that is why programs look very different. She clarified that a concentration means there has to be a focus to the advanced curriculum. The focus could be a generalist perspective, but many programs have specific concentrations such as child welfare, mental health, school social work, etc.

Mr. Riches asked if most programs have a variety of concentrations available, and how many choices are generally available. Dr. Carter stated that CSUS has one advanced multi-level concentration. However, it ranges because some schools have two concentrations, larger schools may have four. It depends on the mission of the school and what they are attempting to do. Ms. Walmsley asked whether a school could have only one concentration, for example in mental health. Dr. Carter responded that this is a possibility.

Dr. Carter explained that there are also opportunities for specializations. For example, CSUS though it only has one concentration, which is multi-level practice, offers a number of different specializations. This means that all students get an advanced curriculum that introduces them to social work in all levels of practice (micro, mid level and macro), and on top of that there are opportunities for specialization, especially with the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) and the stipend programs. Students are not locked in during their second year, but they can choose a set of courses and an internship that allows them to specialize.

Dr. Walmsley asked if CSUS has a medical social work specialization. Dr. Carter stated they do not, but they are also developing an aging specialization. Dr. Carter offered to have other schools represented in the audience come up and talk about how their programs are structured.

Mr. Riches asked at what point students select their concentrations. Ms. Halperin from University of Southern California (USC) stated that students are given an overview of their

choices in January of their first year. During the spring, students choose three agencies specific to their concentration and meet with concentration coordinators. Students will interview in May and will know their placement by July 1. Mr. Riches asked if this process is competitive. Ms. Halperin responded that it is, and is becoming more and more so. The second-year students are interviewing and competing with students at other schools. Mr. Riches asked if the student does not get the placement, could they still do that concentration. Ms. Halperin responded that they will still be able to do that concentration but their placement will be in the second round, which takes them to three other placement choices. USC offers five concentrations and also sub-concentrations.

Ms. Hunter from CSU Chico stated that their structure is similar to CSUS, they have one concentration with specializations in children, family and youth and mental health. She explained that students have the same curriculum in the concentration year, such as everyone has to take a policy class but they would take a mental health policy class if their specialization was mental health. So coursework looks a little different based on the specialization.

Ms. DiGiorgio asked what if a student chooses a specialization and discovers that they don't like it. Do they have to go back and take another specialization? Ms. Halperin responded no, they just work in the field until someone hires them for what they want to do. Dr. Carter responded that CSUS is a little different, as everyone takes the same curriculum in the second year except for the seminar, electives and field placement. They moved away from offering concentrations because students would choose a concentration but then get a job in another area, or decide they wanted to do something different, or their agency needs them to do something different. She explained that there is no perfect curriculum, but CSUS tries to address that by giving everyone a concentrated focus across the board and an opportunity to specialize. There are advantages and disadvantages to both ways.

Ms. Halperin stated that USC is structured a little differently in the second year than CSUS. Previously, the second year curriculum was very specified and tight with only one elective. They did a curriculum revision, and now there are core courses that all students are required to take but they get to choose four electives that are linked to their concentration. They have more flexibility, but the core is very concentration-focused.

Mr. Riches asked about field training. Dr. Carter stated that all MSW programs have 900 hours of supervised fieldwork during the two-year period. She reiterated that accreditation standards specify the minimum everyone must have, but most programs have more than the minimum. Everyone does it differently, some in blocks, some within a semester. Some, such as CSUS requires, spread it out over the course of the four semesters. CSUS screens and closely monitors the field training to make sure the people who supervise have the right credentials and that it is truly an educational experience. The most significant part of the learning experience happens in the field.

Mr. Riches asked if the field placement hours are all tied into the academic calendar or can it be done during the summer or off periods. School representatives responded that it varies. For example, CSU Chico does it only during the academic year, and Long Beach has a summer unit. Mr. Riches asked when someone is placed do they stay at that agency for the whole time or do they move around. At CSU Chico they typically have one placement in the first year and another in the second year.

Mr. Riches asked if there is an on-campus fieldwork course offered that is tied to the field placement. Ms. Hunter stated that it varies from school to school, but they have an

integrated seminar where students meet every other week with the seminar instructor to process their experience and that instructor is also the field liaison that goes out to the agencies to monitor how those placements are going. She explained that CSU Chico also has a three-year program that uses a hybrid model, which is an internet based seminar and meeting face to face two times on campus. Some schools do not have the seminar separated out; they may have that as part of their practice course. Dr. Carter stated that CSUS' program's fieldwork course is part of the practice course. The practice instructor is also the liaison to the agency. However CSUS is considering going back to integrated seminar. USC has an integrated seminar, which is a two-unit pass/fail class and is changing to become a graded class. It meets on a weekly basis for the foundation year only.

Ms. Halperin stated that CSWE does not require field instructors to have a MSW. The reason is that other areas of the country have a limited number of MSWs so it could cause difficulties in finding placements. Dr. Carter stated that CSWE requires a social work focus, so CSUS allows people other with similar degrees to supervise the student on a day-to-day basis but an MSW must spend time with them to assure the social work focus. Ms. Hunter stated that CSU Chico students have a task supervisor that is not a MSW but they also meet for an hour a week with a MSW for individual supervision. It is very challenging to find MSW-level social workers to act as supervisors in their area of the state.

Mr. Wong asked whether there are any field placements in a private independent practice setting, and if there are any non-private practice settings that approximate a 50-minute hour. Dr. Carter replied that CSUS does not place students in private practice. They tend to focus more on non-profits, and if they use a for-profit agency they expect them to pay the student a stipend. They do have students doing the traditional 50-minute hour. Ms. Hunter responded that CSU Chico does not have field placements in private practice, but do occasionally in a for-profit agency. Ms. Halperin stated that they will use any agency that will take their students, and they have students who do 50 hours in a family service agency or in county mental health.

Ms. Walmsley clarified whether schools really do place students in a private practice setting. The school representatives all responded no. Ms. Halperin mentioned that it is a more well rounded experience to work in non-profit and county agencies.

Mr. Riches asked if the site-based supervision provided to students is done individually or in groups. Ms. Halperin responded that USC requires 1.5 hours of individual supervision per student per week. They also ask, if the agency has more than one student, to do one hour of group every other week. If it is a large agency with many trainees they probably have group supervision built into it, usually weekly. They must have individual supervision too. In reality it often gets dropped to an hour per week. Dr. Carter and Ms. Hunter stated that it is the same for their schools.

Ms. Esposito asked Ms. Halperin if USC actually uses a private practice setting for a pre-MSW student. Ms. Halperin responded no, they do not. Ms. Esposito stated that CSCSW would be against such a thing. Since the advent of managed care the resources available to nonprofits has dwindled and it is inconceivable to place a pre-MSW student in private practice.

Dr. Carter stated that it is assumed that when students graduate that they have the opportunity to work in that type of setting. She would find it hard to supervise and would be concerned about the opportunity for exploitation.

Ms. Halperin stated that USC tries not to have students in placements where the student already works, although students would really like that. She tells them that they can only stay there if it is a large enough agency to be in a different location doing something they have not done before. Dr. Carter stated that CSUS does the same thing.

Mr. Riches asked how many full-time equivalent students are in the programs. Dr. Carter stated that CSUS has over 300. Ms. Halperin stated that USC has over 600, but that includes about 100 part-time students. CSU Chico has about 75 full-time and about 30 or 35 part-time students.

Ms. Hunter clarified that the field placement is often where students can get more of a clinical focus if they plan to get licensed, but it is important to remember that not all MSW students plan to get licensed. The curriculum must be able to meet the needs of all of those students. When they have a student who wants to work toward licensure they have that discussion in the placement process, which helps them find the right agency. It is becoming more and more difficult to find because agencies are cutting back and may not want to take students on. To fit more clinical training in the curriculum would be very difficult.

Mona Maggio asked if someone selects a concentration and doesn't want to go down the licensure path, do they ever later find out that their agency will require them to get a license? The school representatives responded yes. Ms. Maggio asked how they would then gain the knowledge to be successful in the licensure process. Ms. Hunter said there is a two-year period in which they are required gain hours of experience toward licensure so it is important to look there to see what is happening.

Dr. Carter stated it is important to remember that unlike other licenses, MSWs can't accumulate their hours until post-graduation. So they get the 900 hours of fieldwork and then the additional 3200 hours. Even if we have students who are clinically focused, do that specialization and placement in that area, most feel they are not ready even with the MSW. They still need experience in the field, that's why the 3200 hours is required. She stated that she couldn't imagine any student leaving an MSW program ready to sit for the LCSW exam, that two-year period is critical.

Dr. Carter stated that she is a perfect example of that. She did a health concentration, worked in hospitals and did not plan to get licensed. But then medical settings began to require a license and she didn't feel able to compete for those kinds of positions. She went back and chose settings where she could get clinical experience. She felt her degree preparation was adequate, and she just needed more experience. Ms. Halperin stated that USC focuses on creating a solid foundation and the students have to build upon that and learn about the different phases of social work and what they want to do.

Dr. Carter moved on to discuss expectations around quality social work programs and referred to page 13. CSWE looks at how programs are governed, such as whether they have adequate resources, the ratios of student to faculty, and the administrative structure. For the most part schools offer small classes and small seminars to promote quality education. CSWE also requires administrative people in place to run program, expectations for the faculty as indicated on page 15. It is expected that the level of diversity in the content of the programs based on local demographics, and diversity is also expected in students and faculty. They look at admissions policies, student admission and retention policies, and a number of other things to ensure quality programs.

Mr. Wong asked if the school representatives could explain how much direct services, clinical social work, and psychotherapy that MSW students perform. Dr. Carter replied that this is not specified in CSWE standards. CSUS does require all students to have at least one field placement in direct service, even if that student only wants to do policy level social work. Because CSUS has a specialization in mental health they know those students have an interest in clinical social work, but it is their belief that clinical social work belongs to all MSW students in every specialization. For example child welfare students need to know psychopathology, good assessment skills, etc. It is important that content in clinical social work is woven throughout the program. As far as psychotherapy, CSUS has classes where it is taught but it is more likely they will get to practice this in the right placement. Everybody gets to perform direct services, everyone gets to do some clinical content, and fewer get to do psychotherapy.

Ms. Hunter stated that CSU Chico is very similar to CSUS in that regard, and that it depends on the student and the agency. The agency is very mindful of when a student is ready to offer psychotherapy students. Ms. Halperin stated that USC is also a little different. Every student gets to perform direct services. Students are required to have 50% of their hours in direct services by January of the foundation year. Direct services may include clinical work, case management and psychotherapy. Many of their students are doing psychotherapy in the first year, even in the first month. It depends on the student, some come in with a lot of experience.

Ms. Hunter stated that there may be some variation in peoples' definition of psychotherapy. Her students get good clinical exposure but they are not doing much intensive psychotherapy. The agencies carefully select a few clients for each student to work with and would choose those clients with a lesser degree of pathology.

Ms. Walmsley stated she went to University of Chicago and in her first year was doing psychotherapy. She stated her opinion is that clinical work includes any face-to-face contact with people. Psychotherapy takes on a meaning of its own.

Ms. Halperin stated that every student is required to do process recordings that their field instructor reviews, at least one per week while in placement. Dr. Carter said CSUS requires journals unless the field instructor specifically requires process recordings. Ms. Hunter said that it would not be possible for the field instructors to review these every week. The field instructors do not have the time to review the process recordings so they moved away from that requirement. Dr. Carter said that the other part of the curriculum design is a concurrent model. They must be in a practice class that compliments field experience.

Mr. Riches asked for the difference between a field class and a practice class. Dr. Carter defined field as internship, but they register for it and receive a grade for it. Ms. Hunter stated they may also have a seminar that accompanies the field class, where they are processing cases.

Mr. Riches asked what is learned in practice class. Ms. Halperin responded that they are learning practice theory; they are applying practice theory in integrated seminar; and they are utilizing practice theory in placement. Dr. Carter stated the bridge between theory and application occurs in practice.

Ms. Jensen stated social work practice is an ambiguous term. It is not truly reflective of what is involved in school curriculum as far as theoretical frameworks and interventions,

and human behavior of social environment. Sometimes course titles do not reflect the nature of what is taught.

Mr. Wong referred to the LCSW exam outline. He stated that being prepared for the exam is based on the coursework that is taught in the MSW program. The outline includes biopsychosocial assessment, diagnostic formulation, treatment plan development, resource coordination, therapeutic intervention, legal mandates and obligations, and ethical standards. The exam is currently structured this way. Are these content areas covered in the curriculum?

Dr. Carter responded yes, there is exposure to that content, but not well enough to sit for the exam once they finish their MSW. Ms. Hunter responded yes, they take a series of practice classes in which the diagnostic and treatment planning is looked at, and they take an assessment course for one semester that focuses on crisis assessment as well as DSM-IV category. In the first foundation of the practice class, they are writing biopsychosocial assessment. Ms. Halperin responded that they cover everything except for diagnostic. USC does not have a required class for DSM. It is offered as a one-credit class elective. Not every placement requires them to have an understanding of diagnostic in a DSM focus.

Ms. Walmsley asked why DSM was not included. Ms. Halperin responded that DSM is considered a specialty of mental health. She stated that it is not included during the foundation year, but it is included during the second year under the mental health tract. Dr. Carter stated that CSUS requires the DSM course. The practice class has a community mental health focus so that they can get that exposure.

Ms. Walmsley asked how field instructors in supervision are evaluated in their skills and their ability to prepare students to practice. Dr. Carter responded that they have an application process for field instructors and take the initial class. There is no interview process. Students and faculty liaisons conduct an evaluation of the field instructor at the end of each semester. Each student has a liaison whose responsibility is to develop the agency and the field instructor. If field instructors do not provide the educational experience that affects the students, then those agencies are not used. Ms. Hunter stated that CSU Chico has a similar process. Feedback is provided from students and liaisons at the end of the year. From that, it is sometimes decided not to utilize certain field instructors. Ms. Halperin responded that USC has an application process. They commit to meeting with field instructors and assess them. However, they do not truly know what it is they are assessing. At the end of the year, students evaluate the field instructors. If field instructors are not doing well, USC tries to not utilize them. Sometimes, however, those field instructors are used when they are finding placement for 2,000 students.

Mr. Wong asked the school representatives to talk about how practice informs education. Is faculty in touch with what happens in the field, in practice and vice versa? Dr. Carter responded that faculty is evaluated at the 10-year and post 10-year. One component of the evaluation is community service. There is an expectation that faculty will continue to be involved in community service. Ms. Hunter stated that CSU Chico is similar to CSUS in that respect. She tries to bring in a panel of field instructors at least once a year to meet with faculty and have a discussion regarding their agencies, trends from the agency perspective, skills and knowledge that students need. They have an advisory board that takes this information and feeds it back into the curriculum. The MHSA Stipend Coordinator on the faculty has been a valuable resource to the faculty. Ms. Halperin stated that every practice faculty at USC is directly involved in the community. One research faculty joined a large Los Angeles organization to do a research study of

evidence-based practice with students in the agency, and put together a conference informing the academic world about what is happening in practice and vice versa.

Mr. Riches asked to what degree is online education being taken up in the social work programs. Are schools offering online courses? If so what courses seem to run best to the online format versus other courses that are not well suited for it. Dr. Carter responded that she is not aware of CSUS delivering a complete program online. CSUS has only offered electives online. They offered a research class once, and it did not have good results. CSUS and CSU Chico are looking at offering some programming for the small northern counties that are most interested in getting people into social work degree programs because they don't have access to the institutions. Ms. Hunter responded that CSU Chico has offered electives and the human behavior course online, and those have done well. They have not offered the practice classed online. This is their first year in offering the hybrid field seminar.

Ms. Jensen stated that there are two complete online social work programs in the nation: Florida State and North Dakota, fully accredited by CSWE. CSU Chico has a 3-year weekend program where students come to campus once a month. CSU Chico wanted to do more frequent field seminars. Many students are in employment-based internships, so there are more critical needs, and CSU Chico wanted to be sure the students were not doing the same jobs and caseloads; they wanted to have more contact with the students. They developed a series of modules where all the students do not have to be online at the same time, but have to complete very two weeks. The modules consist of discussions, both written and verbal. They do verbal case presentation on a case in their agency, and everybody has to respond. There are discussion questions that address a variety of issues. Students are shown what professional social work education looks like; a culture to professional social work is what is focused on all the way through practical documentation, counter transference, secondary trauma, and topics that might come up in a face-to-face seminar. Students either love it or hate it. As an instructor, Ms. Jensen noticed that students go deeper due to the ability to process the information and think about what they write; there is a richness to how the students interact online.

Ms. Halperin stated that the only course that she knows of that is offered online is the DSM.

Ms. Esposito asked the school representatives find that there are political problems with the DSM as an instrument, and if they have a sense from their faculty where there are feeling about the DSM as an instrument. The feedback that Ms. Esposito receives is that the DSM is disliked because it is a labeling instrument.

Dr. Carter responded that a former faculty member at CSU Sacramento wrote a book against the DSM, and the faculty shared that feeling for a long time. Dr. Carter stated that they teach it in the context of the person environment. It's become a bigger challenge with the introduction of the MHSA and putting recovery at the forefront. There was a lot of discussion in the DSM course regarding content. Most of the faculty is now onboard and agrees that this is critical content especially if students are going into a mental health setting. Knowing how to use it, when to use it, how it can be abused and misused along with all the layers is important. About 100 students each year take the DSM course.

Ms. Esposito stated that it concerns her that MHSA students probably have more knowledge of the recovery model than many of the people they are working because those cultures have not changed yet. Without supplying them with the language of mental health as it is now – which is a medical model - they are being put in a disadvantage.

Dr. Carter stated that they have certain field placements that require the DSM course. Ms. Hunter added that it is the tool of the trade for mental health diagnostics and billing. There is an obligation to teach the knowledge of the DSM as well as the limitations, evidence-based practice, and the how the diagnostic clusters are formulated. There is a struggle within the profession, and there will be struggle amongst students, regarding the movement towards the recovery treatment and the varying levels of acceptability in the clinical world.

Mr. Wong asked the school representatives feel that the recovery-oriented model is taught in social work education now, and how they felt about recovery being taught in social work education?

Dr. Carter responded that all of the programs in California that are receiving the MHSA funding have done a great job implementing the competencies into the curriculum. Ms. Hunter responded that some of the faculty members are more traditional psychopathology-oriented medical model driven folks. The school has accepted the charge into making the transformation into a more recovery-oriented language and treatment. They are incorporating those curriculum competencies, but all faculty members incorporate it differently based on their beliefs and orientations. Each university is incorporating it differently, but it is happening.

Dr. Carter added that students are excited about the recovery training. But once they get to the agencies, they discover that the agencies are not there yet.

Dr. Carter asked if the Committee will have dialogue with CSWE. Mr. Riches responded that staff is having a conference call with CSWE representatives in the next week, and will invite them to attend a Committee meeting to join in the discussions.

VII. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Suggestions for future agenda items were discussed under agenda item IV.

VIII. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Esposito stated that recently the BBS created a chart that compared the licensed professional counselors (LPC) with the MFTs and LCSWs. She was appalled at what was listed on the LCSW column – it was not reflective of what the students get in the curriculum. Ms. Esposito asked the school representatives if they could suggest how we might look at the schools and the education process for the purposes of legitimizing the LCSWs, who they are and what they do in the marketplace - the public marketplace, not just the private marketplace – when there is nothing to hang a hat on. How do LCSWs justify what they do and how they are educated?

Dr. Carter agreed that the chart created by BBS was not reflective of what the students get in the curriculum. Schools do have this foundation and standards, but it doesn't all look alike. There is nowhere you can go where it states that all schools of social work has a DSM course unless you go to each school and go through their course catalogues. It would be important to attend a CalSWEC meeting and have that conversation. There's an assumption that social work is not willing to put the curriculum in statute, but there has not been a dialogue about it. There is a strong belief that social work is a lot of things, and social workers do not want to be defined as one thing, and assumed to be nothing else.

Ms. Hunter stated that CSWE came out with field education as being the new signature pedagogy, which is a piece that social workers can hang their hat on. The number of hours completed in the graduate program, the hours completed before licensure, the amount of supervision, and the breadth and depth of field placements all present the case of how skilled and knowledgeable social workers are in a variety of areas.

Dr. Carter stated the social workers have to protect themselves. Ms. Halperin stated that social work is very broad, and it's difficult to protect it if others are saying that there is nothing defining social work as one thing. Ms. Esposito responded that social workers are protected by the bachelor or masters degree in social work, and that justifies the social worker.

Ms. Gonzales asked if it is the responsibility of the Board to protect the integrity of the social work profession or just the title. Ms. Lonner responded that the Board only has jurisdiction over licensees. The Committee's charge is competency as it relates to people sitting for their license.

Ms. Jensen asked if the Board is looking at BSW licensure certification. Mr. Riches responded no, but it has been a discussion over the last 3-½ years. He explained that the Board's charge is public protection. With a new licensing proposal, public harm must be addressed, and the proposed licensing act needs to show how it is going to prevent or reduce the threat of public harm. The profession needs to define that and answer those questions for themselves. Most licensing programs originate from the professional communities that they impact.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:14 p.m.