
**Master Plan
For Social Work Education
In
The State of California**

July 2004

MASTER PLAN FOR SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Prepared by the

**California Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work
c/o California State University, Fresno**

and the

**California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC)
c/o University of California, Berkeley**

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 215, as amended, Aroner

This measure would urge the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California to expand their enrollment in social work preparation programs. The measure would also request the California Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work and the California Social Work Education Center to collaborate with the California Community Colleges, the University of California, the California State University, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and other interested persons to develop a master plan for social work education that addresses the state's shortage of social workers and reflects the state's diverse population, to be submitted to the Legislature by January 1, 2004 (ACR 215, CA State Legislature).

July 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MASTER PLAN FOR SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION	1
IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	1
AUTHORS	3
MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS	4
FINDINGS	5
RECOMMENDATIONS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
PART I: SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA	8
<i>Chapter 1: Background and Rationale for this Report</i>	8
<i>Chapter 2: Factors that Increase the Demand for Social Workers in California</i>	9
PART 2: RESPONSE FROM HIGHER EDUCATION.....	10
<i>Chapter 3: Framework for Educational Response</i>	10
<i>Chapter 4: Response from California State University</i>	11
<i>Chapter 5: Response from University of California</i>	11
<i>Chapter 6: Response from Independent Universities</i>	11
<i>Chapter 7: Response from Community Colleges</i>	11
<i>Table 1. Social Work Education: A Ladder of Learning—Summary Chart</i>	13
PART I:	14
SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA	14
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	15
A. Introduction	15
B. Relevant Studies	17
<i>Child Welfare Services Workload Study, SB 2030 (2000)</i>	17
<i>Human Services Committee Legislative Hearings, 2001</i>	18
<i>UC Berkeley: Studies of Professional Social Work Issues (2001)</i>	19
<i>CSU, Long Beach: The Demand for Social Workers in California (2002)</i>	21
<i>Provision of Services to Older Adults (2002)</i>	24
<i>The Mental Health Workforce: Who Is Meeting California’s Needs? (2003)</i>	24
C. Summary Conclusions.....	25
CHAPTER 2: FACTORS THAT INCREASE THE DEMAND FOR SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA	26
A. Human Deprivations	26
<i>Poverty and Homelessness</i>	27
<i>Mental Illness</i>	31
<i>Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities</i>	33
<i>Illness and Disability</i>	34
<i>Family Violence (Child Abuse, Elder Abuse, and Domestic Violence)</i>	35
<i>Discrimination and Lack of Access to Services</i>	39
B. Federal and State Legislative Mandates	40
C. Socio-Economic Trends	45
D. Workforce Dynamics.....	48
E. Summary Conclusions	52

PART II:	54
RESPONSE FROM HIGHER EDUCATION	54
CHAPTER 3: FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL RESPONSE	55
Table 2. Social Work Education: A Ladder of Learning	57
A. High School Diploma.....	59
B. Associate of Arts (AA) Degree	61
C. Post-Associate of Arts (AA) Certificate.....	61
D. Bachelor of Social Work (BSW).....	63
E. Post-BSW Certificate.....	64
F. Master of Social Work (MSW).....	64
G. Licensing	65
H. Doctoral Education.....	66
I. Summary Conclusions	67
CHAPTER 4: RESPONSE FROM CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU).....	69
A. Overview.....	69
B. Student Enrollment.....	71
Table 3. Total CSU Enrollments by Ethnicity 2000–2003	72
C. Organizational Challenges	73
D. Summary Conclusions.....	75
CHAPTER 5: RESPONSE FROM UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	76
A. Overview.....	76
B. Student Enrollment.....	77
C. Organizational Challenges	81
D. Summary Conclusions.....	84
CHAPTER 6: RESPONSE FROM INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES	85
A. Overview.....	85
B. Student Enrollment.....	85
C. Summary Conclusions.....	89
CHAPTER 7: RESPONSE FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES	90
A. Overview.....	90
B. Summary Conclusions	92
REFERENCES	93
APPENDICES	95
APPENDIX A	96
California State University BSW and MSW Program Enrollment	96
APPENDIX B	97
California State University BSW Program Racial/Ethnic Data	97
APPENDIX C.....	101
California State University MSW Program Racial/Ethnic Data	101
APPENDIX D.....	105
Admissions Data for California State University BSW and MSW Programs	105

AUTHORS

- Chapter 1 Background and Rationale
James Midgley, PhD, Dean and Specht Chair, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley
- Chapter 2 Factors that Affect the Demand for Social Workers in California
Eileen Mayers Pasztor, DSW, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach
John Oliver, PhD, Director, Department of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach
Chris Mathias, MSW, Director, California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), University of California, Berkeley
- Chapter 3 Framework for Educational Response
Teresa Morris, PhD, Director, Department of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino
- Chapter 4 Response from California State University
Teresa Morris, PhD, Director, Department of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino
John Oliver, PhD, Director, Department of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach
David A. Cherin, PhD, Chair, Department of Social Work, California State University, Bakersfield
- Chapter 5 Response from University of California
James Midgley, PhD, Dean and Specht Chair, Department of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley
Ted Benjamin, PhD, Chair, Department of Social Welfare, School of Public Policy and Social Research, University of California, Los Angeles
- Chapter 6 Response from Independent Universities
Beverly Buckles, PhD, Chair, Department of Social Work, Loma Linda University
Marilyn Flynn, PhD, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Southern California
- Chapter 7 Response from Community Colleges
Lorraine Lima, MA, California Statewide Coordinator, Family Development Program, The Community College Foundation

MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS

John Oliver, PhD, (Committee Chair), Director, Department of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach

Teresa Morris, PhD, (Committee Secretary), Chair, Department of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino

Eileen Mayers Pasztor, DSW, (Editor), Department of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach

Dennis Boyle, Director, Department of Social Services, Riverside County

Beverly Buckles, PhD, Chair Department of Social Work, Loma Linda University

David A. Cherin, PhD, Chair, Department of Social Work, California State University, Bakersfield

John Cullen, MSW, Director, Department of Employment and Human Services, Contra Costa County

Cecilia Espinola, Director, Human Resource Agency, Santa Cruz County

Kim Gaghagen, Director, The Glenn County Human Resource Agency

Anita Harbert, PhD, Director, School of Social Work, San Diego State University

Lorraine Lima, MA, California Statewide Coordinator, Family Development Program The Community College Foundation

Chris Mathias, MSW, Director, California Social Work Education Center, University of California, Berkeley

James Midgley, PhD, Dean and Specht Chair, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Ken Patterson, MSW, Director, Stanislaus County Community Services Agency

Janlee Wong, MSW, Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter

Findings

- Currently California has a need for an estimated low of 19,000 trained, educated social workers to a high of 25,000. Since the state's social work programs graduate only 4,500 students annually, there is a shortfall of 14,500 to 20,500 individuals with bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in social work.
- This shortage of social workers has been documented in the following:
 - (a) Senate Bill 2030 Workload Study (2000)
 - (b) Human Services Committee Legislative Hearings (2001)
 - (c) University of California, Berkeley studies of the social work shortage (2001)
 - California State University, Long Beach study commissioned by the California Assembly through the California Faculty Fellows Program (2002)
- This shortage has resulted in a lack of response to the needs of abused and neglected children and youth, the frail elderly, the developmentally disabled, the mentally ill, and the disadvantaged and other high-risk populations. The cost to our state cannot be measured but is visible, for example, through crime, homeless individuals on our streets, and the prison population.
- This Master Plan aims to address the shortage by implementing an integrated workforce development plan that addresses social work education and training at all levels of learning, from high school to PhD.
- Currently California's social work programs produce a culturally and ethnically diverse social work labor force. To keep pace with the demographic changes in our state, this diversity must be encouraged by recruiting these individuals for social work education and supporting them through their educational career.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- The California State Assembly Human Services Committee hold hearings on:
 - (a) Implementing the proposed "Ladder of Learning" (see *Table No.1, page 13*) and the workforce development plan.

- (b) **Connecting job opportunities, social work education, and training programs at all levels of the “Ladder of Learning.”**
- (c) **Addressing the burden imposed on county social service agencies and their social work staff by reducing state and federal legislative mandates.**

- **The California State University review and assess the feasibility of expanding undergraduate and graduate social work programs to address the social worker shortage.**

- **The University of California review and assess the function of doctoral programs with reference to implementing the Ladder of Learning.**

- **The Independent Universities review and assess the function of quality control mechanisms for non-accredited undergraduate social work programs.**

- **The Community College system carry out a study of the link between its human service programs and social work job opportunities.**

- **The Board of Behavioral Sciences hold hearings on the feasibility of a full range of social work licenses and license equivalency with other states.**

- **The research universities (UC Berkeley, UCLA, and the University of Southern California) carry out research on social work practice innovations.**

- **The California State Legislature, as funding permits, initiate a demonstration project to implement this Master plan on a regional, if not statewide basis.**

Summary

The above diverse actions must be integrated in order to have a meaningful impact. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the California State Legislature create a highly visible Social Work Education Master Plan Committee chaired by an appointee of the Assembly Human Services Committee. The charge to this committee would be to identify: (a) time frames for the above recommendations; (b) coordination of effort; and (c) oversight. Members of the commission would include representatives of:

the California Association of Deans and Directors of Social Work (CADD), the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Master Plan assesses the shortage of social workers in California and reviews implications of that shortage for populations of elderly, children, mentally ill, disabled, and homeless in California. It suggests that an educational response and workforce development plan be implemented that addresses education and employment opportunities at all levels of a “Ladder of Learning” from high school to PhD. A summarized version of this ladder is identified in Table 1 below. The full version can be found in Chapter 3 of this plan.

Briefly, the ladder identifies stages of education that can be followed by those who wish to become social workers. It begins with a high school certificate, links to community college credentials, builds to undergraduate and graduate social work education, suggests post-graduate licenses, and refocuses the role of social work doctoral education. Each of these stages, or rungs of the ladder, is linked in an articulated form so that a workforce development strategy is identified. Also, the rungs are linked to job descriptions suggesting employment strategies for social service providers.

This report then discusses the feasibility of implementing this Ladder of Learning and workforce development plan for the various high school, college, and university systems in California.

In a Summary of Findings (see *page 6*), the Master Plan committee urges that in order for the plan to have a meaningful impact a highly visible Social Work Education Master Plan Committee must be convened and chaired by an appointee of the Assembly Human Services Committee. This committee would be charged with: (a) developing time frames for the recommendations; (b) coordination of effort between the education sectors; and (c) oversight. Members of the commission should include representatives of: the California Association of Deans and Directors of Social Work (CADD), the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), the California Social Work Education Center (CaSWEC), the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

PART I: SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA

Chapter 1: Background and Rationale for this Report

- This Master Plan is the first response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 215.
- California’s shortage of social workers has been documented in the following:
 - Child Welfare Services Workload Study, SB 2030 (2000)
 - Human Services Committee Legislative Hearings (2001)
 - UC Berkeley Studies of Professional Social Work Issues (2001)
 - California State University, Long Beach “Demand for Social Workers in California” study for the California Assembly (2002)
 - Provision of Services to Older Adults study (2002)

- Mental Health Workforce: Who is Meeting California's Needs? (2003)
- California's social worker shortage crosses all service areas, including child welfare, mental health, developmental disabilities, and aging and adult protective services. Only school social workers do not report a shortage and, in fact, there is a waiting list of those seeking school social work positions.

Chapter 2: Factors that Increase the Demand for Social Workers in California

- California's residents suffer from a range of deprivations, which typically require the assistance of a social worker. These problems are listed below:
 - *Poverty* (defined as a family of four with an income of \$17,463) is at 12.8%.
 - *Homelessness* includes 361,000 persons on a daily basis.
 - *Mental illness* means that approximately 595,500 individuals receive mental health services annually, reflecting a 100% increase since 1999.
 - *Developmental disabilities* (i.e., cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, Down's syndrome, mental retardation) resulted in 176,928 individuals and families receiving Regional Center services in 2001.
 - *Illnesses and injuries*—largely affecting children and the elderly—require health care; 50% of the children in Los Angeles Unified School District have no health insurance and tend to use expensive Emergency Rooms instead; each day at the University of Southern California Medical Center 150 individuals wait in the ER to be seen by only 13 physicians.
 - *Domestic violence* (more commonly known now as family violence because typically children are witnesses) affects 119,850 Californians annually.
 - *Child abuse and neglect* constitute 21% of the nation's child abuse and neglect referrals, approximately 20% of the country's foster care population resides in California.
 - *Elder abuse* affects 250,000 Californians annually.
 - *Discriminatory practices* reduce access to services for certain typically oppressed populations, including children and women, the frail elderly, gay, lesbian, and transgender adults and especially adolescents, ethnic minorities, and not yet documented residents.
- Socio-economic factors, listed below, influence the need for social services and thus for social workers to connect children, individuals, and families with those services:
 - Reductions in city, county, and state funding;
 - Immigrant population increases;
 - Recession-related budget cuts.

- Legislative mandates affect the demand for social workers:
 - Numerous state Assembly bills (at least five in the past year) require increased social services.
 - Federal legislation mandates specific services and outcomes; for example, the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997 requires that California meet national standards for child safety, well-being, and permanent families. (California has failed its audit.) Social workers are needed to help achieve those outcomes, such as a reduction in child abuse recidivism rates, or an increase in the number of children being adopted.

- Workforce factors affect the demand for social workers:
 - Experienced social workers, the first of the “baby-boom” generation will start to retire in the next 5 to 10 years.
 - Younger human service workers, according to national studies, are not making a long-term professional commitment to social work.
 - Child welfare social workers represent 75% of the social work workforce. Turnover rates are approximately 12%, resulting in a need for approximately 1,000 child welfare social workers annually.
 - Mental health social workers have a vacancy rate from a high of 75% to a low of 25%.
 - National and state studies indicate that unrealistic workloads, poor supervision, administrative turnover, and lack of public support and understanding increase the turnover rate and thus the demand for social workers.

PART 2: RESPONSE FROM HIGHER EDUCATION

Chapter 3: Framework for Educational Response

- Social worker professional education needs to be restructured to meet the following objectives:
 - Include progressive levels of learning from high school through doctoral education;
 - Assess the number of programs in place and that are needed for levels of learning outside the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW), Master of Social Work (MSW), and PhD and Doctor of Social Work (DSW) degrees (e.g., high school, Associate of Arts (AA), and post-AA);
 - Conduct workforce studies to identify job opportunities at each educational level of learning;
 - Obtain higher education, employer, and union “buy-in” for a vision of social work education;
 - Review the function and quality control mechanisms of non-accredited undergraduate social work programs;
 - Conduct workforce studies to determine the effects of this potential restructuring on the social worker shortage;

- Conduct a complete review of social worker licensing function and structure;
- Assess the function and content of doctoral education.

Chapter 4: Response from California State University

- The CSU houses 70% of the accredited BSW and MSW social work programs (12 of the 17 MSW programs and 10 of the 14 BSW programs).
- Six of the CSU campuses belong to a statewide collaborative academy which provides training for child welfare social workers throughout California.
- While approximately 1,500 students are enrolled in BSW programs and 2,000 are enrolled in MSW programs annually, a shortfall exists of 15,200 social worker graduates.
- A cost-benefit analysis is needed to assess the growth capacity of current and new BSW and MSW programs, including advanced standing (accelerated from BSW to MSW) degree programs.
- Filling the shortage of social workers through CSU programs is estimated to cost \$138,510,900.
- The CSU system should make the social worker shortage a priority, with state legislative support.

Chapter 5: Response from University of California

- The UC offers social work education for undergraduate, MSW, and PhD social workers at UC Berkeley and UCLA.
- Approximately 200 students are studying social work at the undergraduate level, 400 students in the MSW programs, and 50 students at the PhD level.
- These programs do not have plans to expand.
- They are heavily engaged in social work research.
- The UC Berkeley undergraduate degree (which is not an accredited BSW) and the UCLA undergraduate social welfare minor aim to produce paraprofessionals who can contribute to alleviating the social worker shortage.

Chapter 6: Response from Independent Universities

- The independent universities are providing social work education at the undergraduate, MSW, and PhD levels.
- They would need additional funding to expand their role in social work education.

Chapter 7: Response from Community Colleges

- The community college environment is ripe for recruitment in the health and human services field; however, up until the last few years, students interested in human services as a career were limited in trying to find a community college that offered this major.

- There is a sprinkling of courses/programs throughout the state, but requirements for completion are inconsistent among programs. Generally, these courses are supported by one or two campus "champions" and are not part of ongoing/regular course offerings.

Table 1. Social Work Education: A Ladder of Learning—Summary Chart¹

Ladder Level	Description	Current Graduates Produced	Future Graduates Needed	Work Skill Sets Graduate Will Have	Job Classifications
1	<u>High School Certificate</u>	Unknown (survey needed)	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Interactive skills, introductory knowledge of theory and practice	Apprentice Social Worker
2 (optional)	<u>AA degree</u>	Unknown (survey needed)	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Introductory intervention skills, some basic assessment, screening, intervention planning under supervision	Assistant Social Worker
3 (optional)	<u>Certificate</u>	Not yet fully developed	Need to do work force study and analysis	As above, plus knowledge of service delivery systems and community assets and services	Trainee Social Worker
4	<u>BSW</u>	300 per year	Need 18,700 combined MSW and BSW.	Casework, community assessment and knowledge of policy	Social Worker One
5 (optional)	<u>Certificate</u>	Not yet fully developed	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Advanced case management and community intervention skills	Social Worker Two
6	<u>MSW</u>	1,200 per year	Need 18,700 combined MSW and BSW	Sophisticated individual and group skills as well as casework expertise, supervisory and leadership skills, ability to evaluate practice and understand research	Social Worker Three
7a Practice	<u>Various Licenses</u>	At present only one kind of license: a clinical license. Currently 300 per year pass oral exam.	Need to do workforce study and analysis	As above but specialized	Licensed Social Worker
7b Education and Research	<u>Doctorate</u>	30 per year?	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Practice, research and teaching skills	Social Work Educator and Researcher.

¹ Full Ladder of Learning table is reproduced on pages 56 and 57.

PART I:

SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

A. Introduction

In May 2002, the California Legislature adopted *Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 215, as amended, Aroner*, which mandated the California Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work and the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) to collaborate with the California Community Colleges, the University of California, the California State University, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and other interested persons to develop a Master Plan for Social Work Education that addresses the state's shortage of social workers and reflects the state's diverse population. The Master Plan was to be submitted to the Legislature in early 2004.

This document is intended to meet the mandate of ACR 215 by outlining a course of action to address the state's social worker shortage. In recognition of current state budgetary constraints, this report does not propose actions involving public resources. Instead, it offers a set of proposals for further discussion and consideration by the Human Services Committee, with recommendations that could be implemented on an incremental basis, or deferred for future implementation.

ACR 215 emerged from a series of hearings convened by former Assemblywoman Dion Aroner, Chair of the Assembly Human Services Committee. Held between February 2001 and July 2002, the hearings were convened in response to growing concern about the shortage of formally

educated and professionally qualified social workers in California. The hearings considered ways in which California's universities could address the challenge. These included, for example, discussions about student recruitment, social work career opportunities, employment conditions, licensing, culturally competent services, and the role of paraprofessionals.

The social worker shortage was linked to earlier concerns about personnel and service delivery issues in the state's child welfare services that, prior to the Aroner hearings, had resulted in the passage of SB 2030, the *Child Welfare Services Workload Study* of 2000. This bill mandated that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) study child welfare personnel and professional practice issues. It was in the context of this initiative that other studies on social services personnel and social worker professional education were conducted. SB 2030 also influenced Assemblywoman Aroner's decision to convene the Human Services Committee hearings.

The School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley conducted three studies for the Human Services Committee. A fourth study, funded through the California Faculty Fellows Program at California State University, Sacramento, provided a quantitative analysis of the social worker shortage on a county-by-county basis and across social service program areas. Two additional studies on the mental health workforce and provision of services to older adults were conducted. These studies and the hearings are summarized below to provide a background to the preparation of the Master Plan.

B. Relevant Studies

Child Welfare Services Workload Study, SB 2030 (2000)

SB 2030 mandated that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) conduct an evaluation of the state's workload and related issues in the field of public child welfare. The study's goals were to: (a) understand the routine activities of child welfare staff in fulfilling their duties, (b) understand the time needed to complete all mandated practice activities, (c) estimate the time required to engage in child welfare practice that can be considered best practice or state-of-the-art, and (d) review the budgetary methodology for statewide child welfare services and for county-level allocations (SB 2030 Final Report, 2000).

California provides child welfare services ranging from one-time assessments to long-term placements. The state's budget for these services is determined by the average number of monthly case counts and current caseload standards. However, this system was first implemented over 15 years ago, and since then, many social work workload changes have occurred. Consequently, the state determined the need to evaluate the current child welfare system and the workload of its staff.

The resulting study was conducted by the American Humane Association, Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc., and several independent consultants. Child welfare workload data was collected from all 58 counties for the period June–December 1999. In addition, the study involved a review of California's child welfare laws and policies and the convening of focus groups. The study report contained specific recommendations relating to optimal workload

standards, policy changes, budgeting, and the need for a plan to increase the number of social workers.

Human Services Committee Legislative Hearings, 2001

Assemblywoman Dion Aroner (D–Berkeley) convened a series of Human Services Committee hearings to address the shortage of California social workers. The first of these, *Planning the Future of Social Work in California: Dealing with the Crisis of Social Worker Shortage*, held in February 2001, focused on the high vacancy rates and issues surrounding recruitment and retention of professionals in social work positions. This hearing also investigated the disparity between the number of graduates from schools of social work in the state each year and the actual number of social workers needed.

The second hearing, *Developing an Action Plan to Solve California's Human Services Workforce Shortage*, held in July 2001, further explored the shortage. Additionally, it began focusing on strategies for ameliorating the problem. Strategies presented during the hearing were:

- The Human Services Academy model (developed by the Los Angeles Unified School District) to recruit youth into the human services profession;
- Social work supervisor training as a social worker retention tool;
- The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) social worker awareness campaign;
- California's teacher recruitment campaign, CalTeach, as a model for social work.

The third hearing, *Social Work Education and the Social Worker Shortage*, was held in November 2001. During this hearing, recommendations surfaced to increase student enrollment at professional schools of social work in California, enhance the relevance of social work education curricula to address public social service needs, and meet public social service staffing needs through pre- and paraprofessional human services training programs.

The final hearing, held in July 2002, was titled *Building a Culturally Competent Human Services Workforce*. Testimony was provided by a panel of experts with knowledge and experience in social work practice cultural competence development.

The results of the legislative hearings (and the Berkeley studies reported on below) were presented in a detailed report, *Recommendations for Addressing California's Shortage of Social Workers: Findings from a Series of Hearings Convened by the California Assembly Human Services Committee*. The report summarized data on the current social worker need, reasons for the social worker shortage, and recommendations for ameliorating the problem.

UC Berkeley: Studies of Professional Social Work Issues (2001)

Two doctoral students and a post-doctoral fellow, under the direction of Dean James Midgley at the School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, conducted three studies between 1998 and 2001 that addressed different aspects of the social worker shortage. The studies focused on graduating students from accredited and non-accredited schools of social work.

They also addressed the possibility of increasing enrollments, and if so, what resources would be needed to meet this goal.

The first study, *CSWE-Accredited Social Work Programs in California: A Graphic Presentation of Statistics and Data*, was conducted by doctoral student Matthew Theriot in 2000. Theriot collected data from 19 schools of social work, some of which have BSW programs, MSW programs, or both. The study found that in 1998, accredited social work programs graduated 1,819 students—1,108 with MSWs and 711 with BSWs. Of the 4,894 applicants to those schools, only 1,822 were accepted.

The second study, *Non-Professional Social Work and Human Services Programs in California* (Theriot, 2001), compared non-accredited and accredited schools of social work through examination of six non-accredited institutions. Findings indicated similarities in curricula, program objectives, field practicum, and program name. Furthermore, those schools have the ability to expand enrollment.

The final study, *The Prospects of Expanding Professional Social Work Programs in California*, was conducted in 2001 by social work doctoral fellow Alison Neustrom and social work doctoral student Ben Barr. The researchers collected information through telephone interviews with the deans and directors of 13 California MSW and BSW schools of social work. The findings indicated that the deans and directors recognized the state's shortage of social workers, and that current enrollment trends were too low to meet the need. The

consensus was that the number of graduates had to be increased and that, with additional funding, enrollment could be expanded.

CSU, Long Beach: The Demand for Social Workers in California (2002)

Three faculty members from California State University, Long Beach applied for and received funding for a study, commissioned by the California Faculty Fellows Program, to: (a) review the literature describing the need for increased numbers of social workers; (b) review California statutes requiring social workers to provide state-supported services; (c) develop a clear operational definition of "social worker"; (d) develop a systematic description of the statewide demand for social workers; and (e) describe the education and/or training level required of social workers to fill identified needs.

Numerical estimates of the need for social workers in California were developed using data collected from county social service agencies that included: (a) the total number of social worker positions in the agency, (b) the distribution of these positions across programs (e.g., child welfare, aging, mental health, disabilities), (c) the educational requirements for these positions, (d) the number of current positions filled by waivers of the educational requirements, (e) the number of current vacant positions, (f) increases or decreases in the number of these positions expected in the next few years, and (g) the jurisdiction's operational definition of "social worker."

The study's limitations included: the short time frame for the research, the collection of data during the holiday period November 2001 to January 2002, and

the absence of data on the need for social workers in the private and/or non-profit sectors.

The findings indicated that:

- 1) The literature points to social work as one of the faster growing sectors of employment and documents the increasing need for social workers in general.
- 2) Few California statutes require social workers to provide state-supported services, most notably in child welfare services; some regulations concern the training that staff must have to perform certain duties.
- 3) A wide variation exists among counties on the definition of what constitutes a “social worker” position, but the most common and critical skill is the ability to assess a situation to determine whether there is a need for services, and if so, which ones.
- 4) Numerical estimates of need were calculated based on data from two-thirds of the reporting counties, covering 85% of the population of California. There were an estimated 12,221 social workers positions at the county level in all 58 counties in California. The vacancy rate was estimated at 9.5% (close to national figures), which translated to a current need for 1,171.5 new social workers (although needs varied widely between urban and rural counties). If turnover rates were taken into account, this would become an annual, rather than a one-time, need. If, in addition, Assembly Bill 364 passed, most counties would double the number of child welfare workers within 5 years. This would increase the need for new social workers from a low of 9,248.5 (with zero turnover) to a high of 22,196.4 (with 20% turnover per year) over the next 5 years. If all types of social workers were considered, the need for new social workers over the next 5 years could climb as high as 25,279.2 (with 20% turnover), even if no new positions are created other than the ones in conformance with AB 364.
- 5) The education and training requirements for social worker positions varied widely.
 - a. At the entry level, the “social worker” job title positions do not require college-level coursework in social work. Educational requirements can be filled by training programs.
 - b. At the advanced entry level, most positions do not require a college degree in social work. Educational needs can be filled by course work at a community college or unaccredited social work program.
 - c. At the lead social worker level, undergraduate courses in social work are generally required. Any increase in the number of these positions would require an increase in the number of persons enrolled in accredited BSW programs in California each year.

- d. At the supervisory level, a master's degree in social work is usually required. Any increase in the number of these positions will require an increase in the number of persons enrolled in accredited MSW programs in California each year.

The study concluded that the demand for social workers will continue to escalate across the program areas of child welfare, disabilities, mental health, and school social work, as California's population grows, diversifies, and ages. Thus, necessary services would not be provided, could be provided by staff with lesser qualifications, or could be assigned to qualified staff already carrying full caseloads, exacerbating turnover. The study recommended that: (a) positions that do not require formal coursework in social work should not have a "social work" job title, and title protection legislation should be passed; (b) opportunities to obtain social work degrees could be increased by expanded opportunities for social work education, including distance education and accelerated BSW–MSW degrees; (c) internships, tuition assistance, and certificates or associate degrees could help entry-level staff advance in the field; (d) retention and recruitment of social workers could be enhanced by creating a more positive public image for social workers improving working conditions, including smaller caseloads, flexible work schedules, and increased support staff; (e) compensation and benefits should be commensurate with the demands of the job; and (f) policymakers should take a leadership role and create a strategic plan to address the shortage of social workers in California (Pasztor, Saint-Germain, & DeCrescenzo, 2002).

Provision of Services to Older Adults (2002)

Scharlach, Simon, and Dal Santo (2002) completed a study that examined the characteristics of personnel in the state who provide services to the elderly population. Their study collected information through a statewide survey of area agencies on agency-specific and countywide adult and aging services departments. The findings indicated that there were 3,270 staff employed in the aging services sector in California, only some of whom had professional qualifications in social work. Because training for professional practice in the field is inadequate, this, in turn, negatively affects the quality of services provided. Furthermore, it is difficult to hire properly qualified employees, including available trained personnel, due to lack of resources. The study also raised the issue of recruiting and retaining sufficiently qualified staff to work with diverse populations, especially those who speak languages other than English. The study recommended policy and program changes.

The Mental Health Workforce: Who Is Meeting California's Needs? (2003)

McRee, Dower, Briggance, Vance, Keane, and O'Neil (The California Endowment, 2003) estimated the current and future needs for mental health workers in California for the years 2001–2010. Although the study was not confined to the need for professional social workers in the state, it did recognize the current shortage of social workers. In 2001, there were 13,000 Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW) in California, representing all social workers in

the state, not solely those in mental health. The study concluded that the current supply of social workers was inadequate for the state's growing needs.

C. Summary Conclusions

California's shortage of social workers is not unique; recent reports indicate that the problem is nationwide. The U.S. General Accounting Office has produced its findings on how the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services can help agencies recruit and retain more child welfare workers (U.S. GAO, 2003). The Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003) has described how human service workers enter the field "mission driven," but that their commitment is eroded by the lack of organizational and public support. In California, specifically:

- This Master Plan is the first response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 215.
- The shortage of qualified social workers in California has been documented through both studies and hearings.
- The shortage of social workers is most evident in the areas of child welfare, mental health services, and aging and adult services.
- Recommendations to address the shortage have been proposed through the above studies and hearings; a strategic, comprehensive plan with legislative and policymaker support is essential, with perhaps incremental steps toward the final goal: a qualified, supported workforce to address the human services needs of California's residents.

CHAPTER 2: FACTORS THAT INCREASE THE DEMAND FOR SOCIAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA

Social work, as a helping profession, was created to respond to the needs of people. No one calls a social worker because he or she is having a good day. As society becomes more complex and perplexing, so do those needs. This may be particularly true for California, because of its geography, size, economy, and diverse population. To explore the need for educated social workers, it is useful to have a framework to help identify the scope of social welfare issues—the circumstances or conditions that result in child, youth, adult, family, and group problems that social workers address. However, the statistics are constantly changing as a result of macro events or “change-drivers” that influence—negatively or positively—social welfare issues. Therefore, a master plan to develop social workers in California must consider: (a) the current and projected quantitative needs, (b) the current and projected “change-drivers,” and (c) the reasons that social workers are better prepared, compared to non-social workers, to address the combined effects of (a) and (b).

A. Human Deprivations

When critical numbers of children, adults, families, or groups experience significant deprivations that could impact society as a whole, social welfare policies are developed to respond. According to Jansson (2000), these seven deprivations can be categorized as material resources (e.g., food, clothing, shelter), mental or emotional (e.g., mental illness), cognitive (e.g., mental retardation), interpersonal relationships (e.g., child and elder abuse), physical

(e.g., handicapping conditions), opportunity (e.g., special programs such as Head Start), and personal rights (e.g., violation of civil rights). Historically, public policies have created mandates to provide specific programs, such as public assistance, child protection, Regional Centers for developmental disabilities, and mental health services. These private needs that require a public response become the responsibility of social service or human services agencies. Professionally educated and trained social workers, with the appropriate resources, are prepared to address these needs.

Poverty and Homelessness

According to the California Budget Project, income has grown slowly for many Californians, increasing by only 10.1% in the past decade compared to 13.8% for the rest of the nation. California's poverty rates range from 6.2% in Marin County to 24.2% in Tulare County. Its average poverty rate of 12.8% exceeds the national rate, with rates of impoverishment generally higher in large urban and rural counties. The income gap is widening between the richest and poorest of California's individuals and families—those who comprise the working poor, the unemployed, and the destitute poor. According to the Economic Policy Institute, while the 2001 recession was challenging for many, including white-collar, highly educated workers, the recovery has been especially tough on minorities.

For those who are fortunate to find employment, wage gain differs by gender, ethnicity, and education. Consider the following data comparing 2001 to 1989:

- Females earned about 87% of the wages earned by males.
- White and Asian workers' hourly earnings increased by 10.3% and 10.8% respectively, while hourly earnings for Black workers remained essentially flat; earnings actually fell for Latino workers.
- Hourly wages for the typical worker with a high school education dropped by 5.5%. By contrast, the median earnings of workers with at least a bachelor's degree increased by 10.4% during the same period. This modest increase will be affected in the future by another aspect of the economy. The state's budget problems have resulted in dramatic tuition hikes for the community and state colleges, which may result in fewer higher education opportunities for more students, especially for those of color who typically are the "first-time college-goers" in their families.

Despite working harder, it is expected that families will continue to struggle to pay their bills. Married couple families worked, on average, ten weeks longer each year in the 1990s compared to the 1970s, with serious implications for childcare and "latch-key" children. Low-income mothers, especially those of color, often must leave their own children unattended to earn money caring for the children of wealthier working White women. Single-parent, female-headed households fare the worst.

Nearly 2 million Californians, including over a million children, live in families characterized as the “working poor,” with incomes falling below the federal poverty level. Low-income families barely survive in the secondary labor market, which is characterized by low hourly wages, no opportunities for promotion, and no benefits, especially health coverage. Nearly two-thirds of working Californians are uninsured. They drive up health care costs by using emergency rooms as primary health care facilities. These families are at risk for losing their cars, their apartments, and even their children when a crisis hits.

Regarding the destitute poor, the annual census indicates that the population of citizens in poverty continues to increase. As a result, in California on any given day, 361,000 persons are homeless; of these, 37% are families with school-age children. These rising figures are expected to climb. While the greatest concentrations of homeless persons are in urban areas, non-metropolitan areas tend to have a greater proportion of homeless families with children.

The public assistance funding stream formerly known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is now called Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). As an overall indication of the need, California is currently spending all of its available TANF funds, and the CalWORKS program is running a deficit.

Individuals and families who are in need of relief turn to public assistance, often with considerable shame and a profound sense of failure, because:

- Most parents who work do not earn enough to support a family.

- Many families that rely on cash assistance have serious barriers to employment.
- Most families do not receive supportive services that could facilitate the transition from welfare to work.

Individuals and families in crisis may be depressed, scared, or anxious. They may not know how to access help or use it effectively. They may speak English as a second language, if at all. Parents and elders may be embarrassed by their need to rely on their children to speak for them. Children from families with annual incomes below \$15,000 are significantly more likely to experience some form of mistreatment. They need intervention from culturally competent social workers who have the knowledge and skills to address any clinical issues of loss and provide problem-solving tools. However, public assistance and housing staff typically are not social workers. They may or may not be college graduates, and their degrees, if any, are generally not in social work. Nevertheless, they may be called social workers, using the title without having the requisite credentials and, more importantly, the essential skills (Pasztor et al., 2002).

The UCLA Anderson Forecast predicted that California's unemployment rate will remain high throughout 2004; higher rates of impoverishment translate into expanded requests for human services. Exacerbated individual, family, and community needs require a commensurate social work workforce. The efficiency with which human service professionals are able to address poverty-based needs would not only maximize the impact of intervention but may also help to

control multiplier effects associated with human needs, as they invariably move along a continuum toward chronic suffering and cost.

Mental Illness

California's Department of Mental Health (DMH) oversees public sector mental health service delivery across all 58 counties. During FY 2001–2002, a total of 595,405 individuals were served through California's public sector mental health agencies including over 197,000 adults with serious mental illnesses and over 106,000 children with serious emotional disturbances. These can include such diagnoses as bipolar disorders (e.g., manic-depressive), schizo-affective disorders, various forms of schizophrenia, obsessive-compulsive disorders, and clinical depression. Clients who suffer these debilitating illnesses may have treatment complications because they are dually diagnosed, meaning that they also are involved with alcohol and other drugs (AOD) in an attempt to self-medicate. Thus, their services and treatment are complicated as they are shifted between mental health facilities and drug programs. The former may require the client to be drug-free before treatment is offered; the latter may require help for the mental illness before drug treatment is begun. Thus, clients are shuffled between two bureaucracies.

Consider the following case example of a relatively simple situation, because the client is not dually diagnosed.

Diagnosed with bipolar disorder as a young adolescent, Robert (now age 30) had three psychiatric hospitalizations before the age of 18, and two more before the age of 25. As an adult, he is able to hold only minimum wage jobs because he is behind several grades

academically and naturally delayed socially. Having parents with resources, he was supported by them and on their insurance until they could no longer afford to help him, due to the cost of his continuing hospitalizations. It took six months (a relatively short time due to parental intervention) for him to become eligible for SSI and Medi-Cal and to be accepted by a board and care facility for housing/meals. Of the \$900 that Robert receives in assistance, almost all goes to the board and care. He is given only \$40/month to cover all his other needs: clothing, hygiene products, entertainment, and transportation. (Cigarettes, typical for most mentally ill adults, rapidly deplete the \$40.)

Robert's medication, paid for by Medi-Cal, costs approximately \$800/month, prevents him from having psychotic episodes. To obtain his medication each month, Robert must remember his doctor's appointment, then travel on his own from his board and care in central Los Angeles to a mental health center on the Westside. He sees a psychiatrist for approximately 10 minutes. The doctor e-mails the prescription to a pharmacy. Robert must then travel from the mental health center to the pharmacy, about four miles away. Provided that the computer is working, Robert can then obtain his medications, which he must take back to the board and care (another five miles) where they are dispensed to him on a daily basis by a rotating staff working for minimum wage.

Robert is more fortunate than most. His parents provide him with a car, auto insurance, repairs, and money for gas. Without this, he would have to get tokens to use complicated public transportation to travel from the board and care to the mental health clinic, then to the pharmacy, then back to his board and care. It is not surprising that most mentally ill individuals—long estranged from family support—cannot navigate this obstacle course and, as a result, do not take their medications. Thus, they have psychotic episodes, are hospitalized or incarcerated, stabilized, and released to the streets to await the next episode.

Individuals suffering from mental illness and alcohol and drug addictions are challenged and challenging. They require assistance from social workers with expertise not only in mental illness and addiction but also psychosocial rehabilitation opportunities, and community resources and services. Because of the multi-disciplinary interactions that are needed (with psychiatrists, for

example), social workers are uniquely positioned to serve the individuals and their families who live with mental illness. Paraprofessionals, under the supervision of professionally educated and trained social workers, could help mentally ill clients access their doctors' appointments and trouble-shoot medication access. According to McRee et al. (The California Endowment, 2003), the overall demand for mental and behavioral health care workers in California between 2001 and 2010 can be expected to grow from 63,000 to between 73,000 and 80,000 (or between 16 and 30%).

Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities

The mission of the California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) is to provide services and supports for individuals and families with physical and developmental disabilities such as attention deficit disorder, autism, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, fetal alcohol syndrome, mental retardation, and multiple sclerosis. California is one of the nation's top four states for children diagnosed with autism. The state's fastest growing disability, autism affects more than 21,000 residents, with a 100% increase since 1999.

Families with children who have physical and/or developmental disabilities face major decisions and lifestyle changes that they may never have imagined. While their children struggle to accomplish basic tasks and come to realize their own abilities, parents must act as medical advocate, principal caregiver, cheerleader, researcher, and financier for children requiring new equipment, therapies, diagnoses, and everyday living arrangements.

Later, when these children become adults and their parents join California's aging population, families will continue to look to their communities for support. For these families, California provided Regional Center services, to 173,193 people and Developmental Center services to 3,735 individuals in 2001 (California Department of Developmental Services, 2002). It is well established that developmentally challenged children are at risk for abuse and neglect primarily because they create frustrations for their caregivers and typically are not able to call for help.

The DDS Strategic Plan for 2002–2006 indicates that its ability to provide statewide services with a budget of nearly \$2.5 billion requires a “strong commitment” from many thousands of volunteers and professionals. Literature indicates that of all the supports needed by families with developmentally disabled children, it is a strong relationship with a social worker that makes a measurable difference in accessing services and supports (Rycus & Hughes, 1998).

Illness and Disability

Two populations with the greatest need for health care are children and the elderly. Nationally, some positive news is that the number of children reported without health care support in 2001—8.5 million—continues to decline. Expanded coverage through public programs (Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Program [S-CHIP]) is helping. Grade-school children, most likely to be exposed to childhood diseases and risk for injury, represent the

largest cohort of children without health care. Latino and African American children comprise over 60% of America's children without health care coverage.

With 3.3 million residents age 65 and older, California is home to the largest elderly population in the country. The fastest growing population group is age 85 and older. Older Americans are at risk for nutritional problems; 21 million nutritious meals are provided annually at 1,000 community-based locations or by home delivery. California's elders will need, in increasing numbers, adult day health care, Alzheimer's day care resources, health assistance, legal assistance, respite care, housing, and outreach. Older Californians are at further risk for lack of health care when those between the ages of 55 and 64 retire and lose their benefits. This population has almost twice the medical expenditures as those a decade younger. More than 3 million Americans in that age bracket are uninsured. Thousands of additional social workers will be needed to assess client need and eligibility and to provide direct and administrative oversight for these programs. Culturally competent social workers will be essential as many of today's elderly came to California as voluntary and involuntary immigrants.

Family Violence (Child Abuse, Elder Abuse, and Domestic Violence)

In the article *The Fate of Baby Boomers and Their Children*, Wattenberg (1986) noted that families can be a haven in a heartless world, or a breeding ground for tragedy and despair. Family violence is the term now used to include domestic violence (spousal or partner abuse), child physical and sexual abuse and neglect, and elder abuse (both physical and fiduciary).

Domestic abuse: State law enforcement offices in California received 196,569 domestic violence calls last year, of which 119,850 involved weapons such as firearms and knives. There were 153 domestic violence homicides (Department of Justice, 2003). This is one social welfare area in which the number of arrests has been declining since 1997, after a rising trend for almost two decades. Factors affecting the change may include public awareness resulting from high-profile cases, women's advocacy organizations, women's resource centers, and legislation. Of five major domestic violence legislative initiatives enacted over the past 20 years, two include provisions for extra training for law enforcement officials. Some pilot programs have been established in which police officers are accompanied by a lay person who provides resource information for the (typically) female involved in the domestic violence case. The lay persons are not expected to have a social work degree.

At particular risk are women from cultures in which domestic abuse is tolerated and women who are unfamiliar with the English language. In some instances, clergy have been known to encourage women to stay in abusive situations (Jansson, 2003). While domestic violence cases are challenging to identify for many reasons, the thousands that are reported require social work professionals with cultural competency to recognize how customs impact both the tradition of violence and the reporting of the abuse. It is imperative that victims be encouraged and supported to step forward to seek help.

Child abuse and neglect: In California, thousands of children are raised in a culture of fear and violence. Of the approximately 3 million child maltreatment

reports in the United States in 2002, nearly 630,000 (21%) occurred in California (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse Neglect Information, 2002; California Department of Social Services, Data Analysis and Publications, 2003). Deprived of models for healthy interpersonal relationships and peaceful households, only a select few of these children will break the cycle of family violence in their own adult households. Those who are placed in the foster care system are at much greater risk of being on public aid, undereducated, in prison, and raising children of their own while still adolescents or young adults (California Department of Social Services, Research & Evaluation Branch, 2002). The direct costs of child abuse and neglect nationwide are estimated at \$25 billion per year, while indirect costs such as juvenile delinquency, adult criminality, and lost productivity to society total \$95 billion.

In response to the California child welfare system's inability to respond effectively to federal mandates for specific outcomes related to child safety, child well-being, and permanency, the California Child Welfare Services Stakeholders Group has developed a comprehensive strategic plan intended to make children safer and families stronger, support youth in foster care, and increase responsive services with more fair and equitable results. This requires that communities share responsibility for child welfare and help families realize their potential. These goals cannot be achieved without a skilled workforce that has a manageable workload. Competent social workers with caseloads above the national standard quickly become less competent; child welfare workers with low

caseloads but no social work credentials may be equally ineffective. It requires a skilled, stable workforce to be competent and culturally-sensitive in:

- Conducting child protective services investigations;
- Making appropriate assessments;
- Working with families to keep their children at home;
- Separating children from parents when foster care is warranted;
- Recruiting, training, and collaborating with foster parents;
- Supporting kinship caregivers;
- Working with all members of the adoption constellation (birth parents, children, adoptive families);
- Working effectively in residential treatment centers with emotionally disturbed youngsters;
- Helping prepare youth for life after foster care, with appropriate community connections, to prevent the entry of former foster children into the homeless population—now at about 50%. These appropriate community connections also may prevent the cycle of dependency in the child welfare system on the juvenile and adult justice systems. The caption on a Child Welfare League of America poster featuring an abused child states, “When I am abused, first I hurt, then I hate, then I harm.”

Elder and dependent adult abuse: Annually, nearly 250,000 Californians are victims of elder and dependent adult abuse. One in 20 elders is a victim of neglect or physical, financial, or psychological abuse. With more than 3.7 million

Californians age 65 or older, and an expected population growth reaching 6.3 million by 2018, the incidence of elder and dependent adult abuse is expected to increase. These discouraging statistics are complicated by the fact that: (a) the public believes that elder abuse is difficult to recognize; (b) only 10% of respondents in a public opinion poll identified elder abuse as a serious concern; (c) the 132,000 annually reported cases of elder abuse in nursing homes are considered to represent less than 10% of the actual cases; and (d) elders over age 80—a growing population—are at highest risk. These numbers are not expected to decrease since California is home to the largest population of residents over 65 years of age (3.5 million), that is expected increase by 172% over the next 40 years.

Abuse of elders and dependent adults requires public education, outreach, and intervention. Institutional abuse may be less likely to occur if credentialed social workers are on the premises. Schools of social work must encourage more students to specialize in the Older Adult and Families (OAF) concentrations in light of the current substantial shortage of social workers with professional education to work with older clients.

Discrimination and Lack of Access to Services

Much less visible in our communities, but equally as challenging to overcome, are the oft-accepted cultural deprivations of individual personal rights. Institutionalized racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism, and discrimination on the basis of an individual's religion, skin color, or physical or mental disability

continues a long-standing American tradition of failure to empower these populations. Rather than encouraging others to share the resources that "mainstream" Americans have enjoyed since the birth of our nation, those with the power to exclude continue to use discriminatory practices, consciously or unconsciously, to maintain their own societal status to the detriment of the "out-group" members.

B. Federal and State Legislative Mandates

In the past decade, larger programs have received increased funding that is tied to legislative mandates and program outcome measures. The goal of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336), and its subsequent additions, is to make facilities, jobs, homes, and services accessible to all Americans. The Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997 (PL 105-89) illustrated a Congressional effort to move children through the foster care systems more quickly and efficiently. The more recent No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (PL 107-110) represents the current administration's attempt to increase flexibility, accountability, and teacher achievement in state public schools. A federal child welfare auditing system is intended to examine each state's child welfare system and impose large financial penalties for failing the audit more than once.

In fact, the field of child welfare provides ample evidence of increased legislative responsibilities for social workers. Since the mid-1970s Congress has enacted at least eight public laws creating service entitlements for children and

families. These laws must be taught to and understood by social workers; adherence is monitored by public agencies and their contractors. The sweeping requirements of ASFA is just one example. This series of federal entitlements and protections in child welfare has proven to be fertile ground for advocacy/public interest law firms. Nearly two-thirds of the states have experienced class-action lawsuits regarding child welfare practices, either by the states themselves or in populous jurisdictions. These lawsuits are most often settled through consent decrees that typically place numerous specific practice requirements on social workers.

In California, hundreds of bills are introduced annually in the state Legislature that impact the workload and caseload of social workers in a variety of programs and services. Most of these bills are state mandates to localities and would require additional social workers to perform additional work.

In many instances, the legislation does not recognize the need for additional social workers or provide funding for them. Results of the Child Welfare Services Workload Study, Senate Bill 2030 (2000), indicated that twice as many social workers were needed to adequately perform the child welfare services as required by the state. While this has been the subject of legislative hearings, no additional funding for doubling the child welfare workforce has been authorized.

A review of just a few of the 2003–2004 enrolled or chaptered legislation, below, indicates continual additions to workload without funding for hiring additional social workers:

- SB 169: Extends sibling visitation rights to inter-country adoptions. Social workers will be required to facilitate such contacts between children and their families of origin.
- SB 549: Provides for skilled nursing facilities for inmates. Social workers would be needed to provide case management and other services in these facilities.
- SB 278: Allows for release of terminally ill inmates to medical facilities. Social workers would be needed to provide case management and other services in these facilities.
- AB 579: Requires siblings of children in the foster care system to be notified of hearings. Social workers are responsible for providing such notice, and addressing the resulting children's emotional and behavioral issues.
- AB 408: Requires social workers to identify persons with significant relationships with children in foster care and to maintain those relationships. This means working with children to identify these individuals, finding them, assessing their safety risks to the child, and incorporating them into the children's lives, within the context of what their foster families will support.

The human service organizational climate is increasingly fluid. In the last two decades, social work practice within these settings is more apt to have been influenced by law, health care, and business. Laws tend to play a more vital role because of increased awareness that social services should protect citizens.

Health care exerts more influence as a result of improved technology and the need to expand citizen access to vital preventative or palliative services. Mounting internal and external demands for accountability and program effectiveness have resulted in many human service organizations incorporating business models as a means of achieving outcome objectives.

Social work practice, formerly driven and influenced by social work ethics and agency oversight, now has significant requirements imposed through statute and externally imposed continuous improvement models. Previous generations of social work practitioners had the comparative ease of primarily focusing on engagement and treatment skills. Today's practitioners have an increased responsibility to understand and apply the legislated practices that govern individual service delivery programs, particularly in public agencies.

The following are further examples of how legislation impact social work: In response to California's failing marks on the 2002 federal audit, a CDSS committee created a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) that will implement the corrective action needed as identified in the federal audit. As a result of the PIP, California social workers have been impacted by activities and tasks mandated by the federal Child and Family Service Review process and state Assembly Bill 636. Each measure requires the use of outcome data to inform practice improvements.

AB 380 (Steinberg, Statutes of 2003) introduced more qualitative outcomes measures for the 10,000 children served by our Children's System of Care (CSOC). These severely emotionally and behaviorally disturbed children

are entitled by state and federal law through a number of programs to receive specific treatment for their illnesses.

Assembly Bills 26 (Migden, Statutes of 2000) and 25 (Migden, Statutes of 2001), and 205 (Goldberg, Statutes of 2003) established and solidified California's Domestic Partner Registry for same-gender and senior citizen couples. According to Equality California (2003), 20,215 (out of an estimated 100,000) Californians in same-gender relationships have already registered as committed domestic partners.

As elderly citizens become a larger proportion of the national and California populations, it is likely that similar Congressional protections and practice requirements will become standard features of adult and aging service programs. Congress is currently considering Senate Bill 333, the Elder Justice Act. A coalition of disabled Americans was influential in litigation that resulted in the 1999 federal court "Olmstead decision," which critically influences service delivery decisions made by social workers and their clients.

Unlike social work education programs, most public and private social service agencies are not accredited. As a result, many public and private agencies seek to avoid litigation-driven practice by holding themselves to a high standard. Nationally, this has led to an increased rate of social service organizations seeking accreditation from such bodies as the Council on Accreditation of Services for Families and Children. These accrediting groups require agencies to use research and business models to analyze and improve policies and practices. They also acknowledge social work as the recognized

professional discipline for social service delivery, thus increasing the demand for social work practitioners.

Finally, if the Open Dependency Court bill (AB 2627) passes, at least in child welfare cases, courtrooms would be open to the public and the media. Anyone would be able to sit in on any child physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect hearing. The intent is to inform the public about the quality of social services and demystify the system. There would be, however, unintended consequences—on the children and families involved when neighbors and others can watch the proceedings as well as on social workers.

The net result of federal and state legislation not only demands more social workers, but requires that they become more facile in understanding and applying laws. They also are increasingly under public scrutiny. But perhaps, as more agencies seek accreditation and as the public becomes more informed of the difference between those who hold social work degrees and those who do not, the quality of social services in California will improve.

C. Socio-Economic Trends

In addition to deprivations and legislation, other factors will likely reduce and/or expand the projected human service needs and workforce demands overviewed in previous sections of this report. If the state's recession is shorter than projected, if major market sectors respond by expanding production and reducing unemployment, and if significant progress is made in balancing the state budget, it would be reasonable to anticipate a reduction in individual, family,

group, and community reliance on human services. Under these positive outcomes, schools of social work would continue efforts to graduate additional baccalaureate and master's-prepared social workers. In contrast, the health/medical, mental health, social, emotional, and other deprivations and needs previously identified could persist, or even worsen, and the economy could further falter. Service demands would likely increase, but schools of social work would be impacted in ways that could dramatically reduce their productive capacity.

For example, accredited schools of social work must provide their undergraduate and graduate students with 450 and 1,000 hours, respectively, of field placement or internship. This experience must occur in social service agencies or organizations—whether in the public, voluntary, or for profit sectors—with field instructors who hold an MSW degree and provide one-on-one supervision. As budgets are cut and community programs are forced to reduce their staff, field placement resources dwindle, leaving insufficient staff to supervise student interns. The integrity and the viability of social work programs are affected. In fact, accreditation may be compromised if students cannot fulfill the requisite agency field placement and supervision requirements.

At the beginning of this chapter, a number of deprivations were identified that impact individual, family, and community efforts to satisfy basic needs. Each of the identified problems is currently more difficult to manage due to an array of overarching factors that exacerbate existing problems and constrain the impact of interventions designed to contain and/or control them. Additionally, when

services and opportunities are unavailable, communities struggle to achieve the societal norms reported in other areas of the state. For example, lack of local and state funding for public schools in economically impoverished districts results in a lack of quality education. Additionally, tutoring, extracurricular activities, or other supplemental academic services may not be available, and Californians without cars or money for public transit are without access to needed destinations. Consequently, poor municipalities cannot provide basic supportive services that might otherwise address social deprivation issues.

Moreover, the California Department of Finance (2000) reported that this state attracts 48% of the country's immigrants. Next to Hawaii, California is the most diverse state, a reputation that is expected to remain true in the future. From countries as far-ranging and diverse as Armenia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Laos, Mexico, Thailand, and Taiwan, immigrant groups continue to seek the "American Dream" here in the nation's most populous state. For those in the growing immigrant population who may be learning English as a second or third language, accessing programs in underserved areas becomes even more difficult.

Political, programmatic, and legislative efforts continue to change the cultural landscape of California. As the United States continues to fear terrorist attacks after the Oklahoma City and 9-11 tragedies, national leaders introduce measures and take actions that support the fluctuating priorities of our nation and, therefore, our state. Funds that might have been spent on improving our public schools and our senior citizen health programs are now being diverted to

homeland security projects and wartime efforts. Although people consistently tell pollsters that they worry about domestic problems as well, such as access to health care, lack of media attention to these issues and focus on the war and terrorism mask the extent of our social ills at home.

There are, however, ways to bring about change on multiple levels that could serve to ameliorate these vast and numerous social ills. Legislation and implementation of new laws, the overhaul of outdated organizational policies in poorly functioning agencies, and perhaps other factors as well can move the state toward better health, literally and figuratively.

D. Workforce Dynamics

A 1999 study on the aging state and local government workforce revealed that 42% of employees in these sectors were between ages 45 and 64. The 15.7 million employees included in this study are now between the ages of 48 and 68. The emerging problem resulting from the retirement of baby boomers, according to the Rockefeller Institute of Government, represents the most significant talent and brain drain ever experienced by government, the potential impact of which has been likened to an unstoppable locomotive.

While comparable studies focusing on California's social worker workforce are not currently available, there is significant agreement among county welfare directors that the accelerated loss of experienced workers is of considerable magnitude and importance. Significantly, there is also agreement that the implications of this problem for workforce development and management will be

further exacerbated by employer strategies designed to minimize the negative impact of recession budget reductions. Additional challenges to workforce growth and stabilization are associated with maturing workers redefining retirement, as well as mounting questions raised by this cohort regarding the prospects of achieving and/or enhancing self-actualization through county human service jobs.

Added to the issue of retaining experienced social work employees are problems of attracting and retaining “Generation X” workers. This cohort of prospective social workers is more prone than past generations to link employee loyalty and employment longevity to the quality of the work environment.

Workforce stabilization is an important change-driver because of its contribution to: (a) enhancing the prestige of social work as an attractive career option, (b) maintaining program cost effectiveness, and (c) protecting the quality and operational integrity of human service delivery systems. Social workers in California face many challenges while pursuing the highest quality of services for their clientele. These include the shortage of social workers in the state, which leads to a shortage in the workplace, which in turn creates increased workloads. Inadequate salaries, an unsupportive work environment, and the relatively low esteem in which social worker positions are viewed continue to be obstacles to retaining and recruiting social workers.

As previously indicated, *The Demand for Social Workers in California* study (Pasztor et al., 2002) calculated the number of social workers currently needed in the state by analyzing data from the responding 39 of the state’s 58

counties, (representing 85% of the state population), taking into account the number of child welfare workers and the number of vacancies in these counties. The study estimated that child welfare workers represent approximately 75% of the total 12,221 social workers in the state. It also found that “public agencies which employ social workers experience an average turnover rate of up to 20% per year” (p. 21). This number can be adjusted downward for those who may move to another county or leave the profession. However, even with this adjustment, it was estimated that the actual turnover rate is between 12% and 15%, which translates into approximately 1,099 to 1,374 social workers needed statewide annually in public sector child welfare services (Pasztor et al., 2002).

These numbers represented only the public sector child welfare needs. They did not include private sector needs, as well as other social service sectors such as mental health, aging, etc., which would make the number higher. A California State Department of Mental Health study (2001) reported that the mental health system in California had 2,500 vacant social work positions. The director of the Riverside County Department of Mental Health reported a vacancy rate for social workers of about 20% in mental health agencies in his region, which was slightly lower than the average statewide rate of 25%. The developmental disability sector that contains the state’s 21 Regional Centers also reported a vacancy rate of 25%. Similarly, the aging and long-term sectors reported a 20 to 30% vacancy rate, with 75% of aging care facility administrators stating it was difficult to recruit and hire MSWs. Additionally, according to the vice-president-at-large of the County Welfare Directors Association, the 10

largest county welfare offices alone need about 3,400 social workers immediately. These statistics include all public sector human service social work positions (Pasztor et al., 2002).

In summary, if all public sectors are combined, the number of social workers needed to fill the vacancies would greatly exceed the number of social workers being produced by our universities. It has been reported that California produces fewer social work graduates, per capita, than other large states with a high demand for social services. California's need for additional workers is not met by the relatively small number (approximately 1,800) of graduates from social work programs each year.

Testimony at the Aroner legislative hearings revealed the relationship between low salaries and the difficulty in recruiting professionals to the human services work force. Scharlach et al. (2002) and Pasztor et al. (2002) concurred. In addition to competitive salaries, adequate benefits, effective management, high quality supervision, effective and consistent agency administrators, and increased public support might attract more individuals to the social work profession and, at the same time, give current social workers a greater sense of worth. *The Demand for Social Workers in California* (Pasztor et al., 2002) as well as testimony at the Aroner hearings noted that workplace practices such as flexible hours and family-sensitive support might improve working conditions. Both sources concluded that there is a need for a clear career ladder, thus giving social workers greater incentive to perform well and stay on the job. Also needed is a more definitive and positive public image for the social work profession.

E. Summary Conclusions

- Deprivation in several areas affects the demand for social workers in California:
 - Poverty (defined as a family of 4 receiving an income of \$17,463) is at 12.8%; and 361,000 persons are homeless annually.
 - Approximately 595,500 receive mental health services annually.
 - 21,000 residents have been diagnosed with mental illnesses, a 100% increase since 1999.
 - Regional Centers provided services to 176,928 people in 2000.
 - Health services are needed primarily for children and the elderly.
 - Family violence, including domestic violence, child abuse, and elder abuse, affects hundreds of thousands of our residents annually.
 - 21% of the nation's referrals for child abuse and neglect are in California.
 - Approximately 250,000 persons are victims of elder and dependent adult abuse per year in California.
 - Discriminatory practices reduce access to services for certain groups, especially those who cannot speak English and sexual minorities, especially transgender youth, and to a greater extent gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and questioning youth in the foster care system.
- Societal trends affect the demand for social workers:
 - Cuts to social services as a result of current recession;
 - Reductions in local and state funding in general;
 - Increases in the immigrant population;
 - Legislative mandates to reform social services and improve services.
- Legislative mandates affect the demand for social workers:
 - At least five Assembly bills in the last year require increased services;
 - A proposed Assembly bill that would open dependency court to the public and media might impact social worker retention and recruitment;
 - There is now federal legislation that includes penalties for failure to meet outcome measure goals.
- Workforce dynamics affect the demand for social workers:
 - Experienced social workers will begin to leave the profession as the first of the "Baby Boom" generation enters retirement,
 - Younger workers tend not to make a long-term commitment to a profession such as social work.
 - Child welfare social workers, who represent 75% of the social work workforce. Turnover rates are approximately 12%, resulting in a need for approximately 1,000 child welfare social workers annually.
 - In mental health, the vacancy rate for social workers is 25%; the rate is as high as 75% in some arenas.

- Uncompetitive salaries, poor working conditions, unsupportive and ineffective management and supervision, and lack of public understanding and support tend to drive social workers from the profession.

PART II:
RESPONSE FROM HIGHER EDUCATION

CHAPTER 3: FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL RESPONSE

Currently, social work education is housed in university settings. A “lifelong” learning path in the social work profession is assumed to range from the undergraduate to the doctoral level and involves three steps: achieving the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW), the Master of Social Work (MSW), and the Doctor of Social Work (DSW), or Doctor of Philosophy in Social Work (PhD). Additional licensing and continuing education units (CEU) are required to protect the client rather than advance the student’s academic goals. Education offered outside the university setting is labeled “training” rather than education and does not count toward any of the three educational degrees. It is assumed that the typical social worker will gain a BSW, then aim for an MSW, and finally achieve and maintain LCSW (Licensed Clinical Social Worker) status by passing an exam and taking CEUs. This is a clear but limited vision for social work education. To respond to the critical situation described in Part I of this report, social work professional education, however, may need to be redesigned.

A recent trend of introducing generalist practice into the workplace is evidenced by the challenging of organizational barriers between public assistance (TANF), Child Welfare, Mental Health, and Adult and Aging Services. Such practices suggest philosophies that make the client the focus of services, rather than the service itself, and it makes interdisciplinary teams a preferred intervention strategy (Tracy & Pine, 2000). Another trend is the hiring of less qualified personnel into social work positions. According to the Hartford Study *The Labor Market for Social Workers: A First Look* (Barth & Pho, 2001), in 1999,

only 30% of child welfare social workers had undergraduate degrees and 10% had no college education.

Further evidence of deprofessionalization was acknowledged when the National Association of Social Workers reported that in every field of social work practice, in every level of government, and in the volunteer sector, the declassification of professional social work had become a “dismal reality” (National Association of Social Workers, 2003). Today, the state needs an educational response that combines the desire to change the structure of the social work workplace with the need to rein in the deprofessionalization that threatens the quality of services and places clients at risk. The continuum of learning in social work education has been discussed for many years (Anderson, 1985; Gross, 1992; Hoffman, 1992; Raymond & Atherton, 1991), framed around the relationship between the BSW and MSW and the progression from generalist to specialist practice, rather than the broader ladder and matrix concept suggested here and identified in Table 2 below.

For social work professionals, this career development may begin in high school and continue until after the doctorate is achieved. This Ladder of Learning would include levels of education and/or training, job titles/descriptions that accompany those levels of learning, and commensurate funding and technology. It would combine education and training into an integrated, articulated educational progression. The term “training” is used here to describe the various institutions that social work employers have created to provide focused, short-term, pragmatic training for social work employees. Combined

Table 2. Social Work Education: A Ladder of Learning

Ladder Level	Description	Current Graduates Produced	Future Graduates Needed	Future Funding Needs	Funding Sources	Organizational Challenges	Work Skill Sets Graduates Will Have	Job Classifications
1	<u>High School Certificate</u>	Unknown (survey needed)	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	Schools, State Departments of Human Services, Counties and other employing agencies	This program exists in some high schools and some work settings.	Interactive skills, introductory knowledge of theory and practice.	Apprentice Social Worker
2 (optional)	<u>AA degree</u>	Unknown (survey needed)	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	Community College System, State Departments of Human Services, Counties and other employing agencies	Needs a job designation from employers. Need to negotiate “deprofessionalization” issues.	Introductory intervention skills, some basic assessment, screening, intervention planning under supervision.	Assistant Social Worker
3 (optional)	<u>Certificate</u>	Not Yet Fully developed	Need to do work force study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	TANF, State Departments of Human Services, Counties, and other employing agencies.	Needs acceptance from Universities and Community Colleges. Maybe developed as stop gap for current regional shortages	As Above plus knowledge of service delivery systems and community assets and services.	Trainee Social Worker
4	<u>BSW</u>	300 per year	Need 18,700 combined M.S.W. and B.S.W.	In CSU would need (18,700*\$7,407= \$138,510,900 combined B.S.W. and MSW	Universities, Department of Social Services Counties and other employing agencies	Will be increasing demand, therefore, expansion needs.	Casework, Community Assessment and knowledge of policy.	Social Worker One

Table 2. Social Work Education: A Ladder of Learning (Continued)

Ladder Level	Description	Current Graduates Produced	Future Graduates Needed	Future Funding Needs	Funding Sources	Organizational Challenges	Work Skill Sets Graduates Will Have	Job Classifications
5 (optional)	<u>Certificate</u>	Not Yet Fully Developed	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	Universities, State Departments of Human Services, counties and other employing agencies	Support and recognition from employer. Might lead to MSW	Advanced Case Management and community intervention skills.	Social Worker Two
6	<u>MSW</u>	1,200 per year	Need 18,700 combined MSW and BSW	In CSU would need (18,700*\$7,407= \$138,510,900 combined BSW and MSW	Universities, State Departments of Human Services, counties and other employing agencies	Needs changes by employment and education settings. Need curriculum changes role re-definition and salary changes. Changes in CSWE accrediting bodies.	Sophisticated individual and group skills as well as casework expertise. Supervisory and leadership skills. Able to evaluate practice and understand research.	Social Worker Three
7a	<u>Various Practice Licenses</u>	At present only one kind of license: a clinical license. Currently 300 per year pass oral exam.	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	Universities, State Departments of Human Services, counties, other employers	Major reorganization needed. This will probably lead to political battles with Licensing Boards and various social work interest groups.	As above but specialized.	Licensed Social Worker
7b	<u>Doctorate Education And Research</u>	30 per year?	Need to do workforce study and analysis	Need education, training and, workforce assessment	Universities and Employers	Major shortage. Change university approach to PhD education, e.g. part time and distance programs	Practice, research and teaching skills	Social Work Educator and Researcher.

university and employer resources could support this integrated ladder, or matrix, to offer a vision and mission for the social work profession's educational programs in California.

As shown in the Table 2, the ladder begins at high school, progresses to the Associate of Arts (AA) degree, post-AA Certificate, BSW, post- BSW Certificate, and MSW, and ends with various forms of licensing and/or a PhD or DSW. The certificate concept introduces the idea that social workers can be on two rungs of the ladder simultaneously, positioned to move up, when ready. Also, the ladder suggests both an upward career path progression and, concurrently, assistance from those on higher rungs through instruction, mentoring, and/or supervisory support.

A. High School Diploma

The current commitments to service learning and community volunteerism in high schools make social work perfectly positioned to encourage certificate training that could lead to a paid position as an "apprentice" social worker. Such certificate training could be implemented in high schools in collaboration with employers. This would introduce young people to the social work profession and address client needs while supplementing the services offered by employment specialists and social workers. The funding stream could come from the collaborating agencies and organizations, with foundation support. This would necessitate curriculum change in high schools and employing agencies in terms of structuring curriculum in the school, assigning caseloads in the county, and

addressing liability issues. The social work competencies needed at this stage would include development of empathy and understanding for clients and the ability to work collaboratively with supervising social workers. The high school students may be able to spend protracted periods listening to and becoming sensitive to client concerns. A certificate could be awarded for basic interpersonal skills including: interactive skills, social responsibility, cognitive skills, understanding of diversity, and knowledge of oppression, privilege and equity. Clients' need for human contact would be addressed, and the outcome could be improved client functioning.

In Los Angeles County, this model is already being implemented in high schools through the L.A. Human Services Academy. The Mental Health Department, in collaboration with school districts, recruits ninth and tenth graders to work for pay in their junior and senior years and to be mentored in college for at least two years to study social work and/or human services. Students take one "Introduction to Human Services" course in high school and then complete this two-year program. Their work includes arts and crafts and reading to clients. In total, the program works with students for six years, throughout high school and two years in college. It has attracted foundation funding and qualified for "Zone Academy Bonds," according to testimony at the legislative hearing on the "Human Services Workforce Shortage" convened by Assemblywoman Dion Aroner on July 17, 2001. Currently, no data is available on how many similar programs exist in California, how many are needed, and therefore, the cost of

future development. Such data collection would be needed in the initial stages of implementing the social work master plan.

B. Associate of Arts (AA) Degree

The AA degree is the next step on the ladder for someone considering a BSW. The AA would build on the apprentice social worker's interpersonal skills with training in basic interviewing, while informing students about individuals, families, communities, and organizational settings. Employment opportunities could include TANF work, family support, and homemaker assistance along with basic family assessments (income, shelter, food, and clothing) and preparation of initial intervention plans. Creation of such positions would require collaboration between county, non-profit employers, and community colleges, with commensurate funding. These fledgling social workers could provide services to individuals and families, could conduct basic financial assessments, and would be supervised by staff with BSW or MSW degrees. Outcomes for clients would include adequate provision of basic subsistence services. Data is not available on the number of potential graduates from such degree programs. A workforce analysis must be conducted to help project need and funding requirements.

C. Post-Associate of Arts (AA) Certificate

This certificate would be offered collaboratively by employers and four-year universities as an incentive for completion of a BSW degree. Currently, a statewide system of public child welfare training academies is in place. Collaborative groups, including representatives from local university social work

departments, county social service agencies, and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), administer these academies. The training is responsive to the needs of the county employees and tends to be of limited duration, narrowly focusing on specific theories, skills, and competencies relating to a particular issue. Training topics include recognizing and respecting diversity, working with the juvenile court, understanding the impact of abuse and neglect on child development, maintaining safe practices, and conducting risk assessments. Academies could broaden their offerings to include certificate programs in human behavior, social welfare policy, and community organization. The university curriculum review process would need to recognize this certificate. (This would constitute a major change to the university culture since training offered outside the university would then be recognized by “the academy” as a form of higher education.)

Once this certificate concept had been endorsed, its courses could be considered for transfer toward a BSW. Meanwhile, employers and unions would need to validate the AA-degree holder as having a credential that brings commensurate respect and income. The job title/description could be “trainee social worker.” Competencies would include provision of more intensive, longer-term instrumental and social services to clients. These new workers would also begin to understand community and organizational interventions, under the supervision of a BSW social worker.

D. Bachelor of Social Work (BSW)

Social workers who hold the BSW are already established as being generalist social work practitioners. This is the point in the Ladder of Learning where trainee social workers would develop an overall understanding of the social work role and adopt the professional identity of the social worker. BSW social workers already have an established role in the workplace. In children's services, mental health settings, and hospitals, for example, the BSW social worker does screening and risk assessment. This social worker may be a case manager who should not intervene intensively with clients unless supervised by an MSW social worker (Rittner & Wodarski, 1999; Levin & Herbert, 1995).

In addition, the BSW social worker has knowledge of community and policy practice. Often, especially in non-government settings, they have community practice responsibilities. This rung of the ladder is currently an arena struggling between contradictory workplace demands for generalization and for specialization. For example, educational practice suggests specialization at the MSW level and generalist practice at the BSW level. In addition, a number of non-accredited undergraduate programs offering social work instruction are not nationally regulated, but their graduates often advance to MSW programs and work in social work settings. A clearer articulation of this level of social work in the context of the Ladder of Learning is essential.

E. Post-BSW Certificate

Like the post AA certificate, this “stand alone,” post-BSW certificate could be offered through collaboration between four-year universities and employers. It also needs to be vetted by the university curriculum development process. This certificate could act as an incentive to pursue the MSW degree, since it would include courses transferable toward an MSW. At this level, social workers would begin to develop specializations in various fields of practice. This could include certificates in case management, community organizing, working with specific populations (e.g., child welfare) or with specific problem areas (e.g., mental health). The role of BSW social workers with this certificate could be to assess and intervene with clients, using their particular specialization and under MSW supervision. Funding streams for such certificates would need to be developed through collaborating universities and employers. Both entities would need to acknowledge that the certificate is an important contribution to educational progress. Universities must recognize the certificate to be worth the additional curriculum development investment as well as the overall role of academies in post baccalaureate education. Agencies would have to invest in commensurate salary adjustment for the certificate holder.

F. Master of Social Work (MSW)

The social worker with an MSW degree would be at a higher leadership and service level than at present, given all the rungs of the Ladder of Learning that this social worker would have already climbed. The MSW curriculum would

be an in-depth education in a particular concentration. The focus would also include leadership and/or expertise in all skill levels of practice, supervision, training, and research. In the workplace, the MSW degree holder would be a supervisor, manager, director, or expert private practitioner and be able to demand the requisite salary for such a role.

As noted in Part I, California has a serious shortage of individuals with MSW degrees. Addressing this shortage requires levels of funding which are not available at this time. Thus, some of this shortfall can be met by MSW social workers assuming managerial and supervisory roles, with the assistance of less experienced social workers. However, the need for MSW social workers still has to be confronted. A workforce analysis could document how much of the shortfall might be addressed by such an approach and how many additional MSW social workers would still be needed.

G. Licensing

Since MSW social workers sometimes obtain a clinical license (LCSW), this license does not have a clear linear position in the proposed Ladder of Learning (see Table 2). If the above professional education structure were implemented, the license would be redundant, since licensing function is not to increase educational knowledge but rather to certify that social workers will do no harm to clients. If social workers were required to progress up the rungs of the ladder described, their performance would have to be repeatedly assessed. However, even if the above structure were implemented, licensing boards are not

likely to accept this argument. Licensing could be incorporated into the Ladder of Learning by requiring universities and academies to take responsibility for license preparation. There could be various licenses according to level and field of practice. The license could be seen as a parallel experience to physician medical residency requirements. There would be supervised classroom and field experience. The university would administer this education in collaboration with teaching agencies, much like teaching hospitals. Such collaboration has already been explored and found to be beneficial to students (Hopkins & Mudrick, 1999).

Of course, this would require collaboration among the Board of Behavioral Sciences, universities, academies, and employers, with an infusion of considerable resources. In addition, protracted political battles could be anticipated both within and outside the profession. However, with current concerns regarding the model law for social work regulation sponsored by the Association of Social Work Boards in 1999, this may well be a timely debate.

There is only one type of social work license, and approximately 300 California Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW) are certified per year. A workforce study is essential to determine projected needs, costs, and benefits.

H. Doctoral Education

The ladder raises questions about the function and content of a doctoral program. The social work doctorate could follow the traditional academic model of a research education, or it could include a combination of practice, teaching, and research. The specific and expanded roles of the doctoral level social

worker should be considered. Should doctoral-level social workers teach and carry out research for all the levels of the social work Ladder of Learning and, therefore, should they have a broader education, rather than the traditional specialist education? Should doctoral-level social workers expand their roles to workplace-based instruction and research? What is the role of the doctoral-level social worker in relation to licensing as discussed above? With the major shortage of PhD and DSW social workers, should they, like the proposed MSW social workers, take on supervisory and leadership roles in research and education, while non-doctorate social workers carry out the day-to-day student instruction? Should more opportunity be available for doctorates through distance learning, part-time programs, and web-based instruction? Such questions are timely in light of the current shortage of social work faculty.

Given the education and research requirements presented in the Ladder of Learning, it may be challenging to estimate the future need for doctoral-level social workers. Currently, California has four doctoral programs: UC Berkeley, UCLA, USC, and Loma Linda University. Together, they produce approximately 30 graduates per year. As this is the most intensive and costly level of education on the ladder, it needs special consideration.

I. Summary Conclusions

- Redesign our approach to social work professional education so that it includes all levels of learning from high school to PhD.
- Carry out studies to determine the existing number of programs for levels of learning outside the BSW, MSW and PhD/DSW.
- Conduct a workforce study to identify job opportunities at each level of the ladder of learning.

- Obtain higher education, employer, and union “buy-in” to this new vision of social work education.
- Perform a study of both the function and quality-control mechanisms of non-accredited undergraduate social work programs.
- Conduct a workforce study to determine the extent to which this restructuring can address the shortage of MSW social workers.
- Complete a review of the function and structure of licensing social workers.
- Review the function and content of doctoral education.

CHAPTER 4: RESPONSE FROM CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU)

A. Overview

The CSU provides education from the third to sixth rungs of the Ladder of Learning through the BSW and MSW degrees, and professional training. It also has articulation agreements with educational providers for the second rung of the ladder and outreach activities of the first rung of the ladder.

The CSU system has 23 campuses, 407,000 students, and 44,000 faculty and staff. Its mission is to:

- Advance and extend knowledge, learning, and culture;
- Provide opportunities for intellectual, personal, and professional development;
- Prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture, and future;
- Encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study;
- Offer undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to bachelor's and higher degrees in liberal arts and sciences, applied fields, professions, including the doctoral degree when authorized;
- Prepare students to work competently in an international, multi-cultural society;
- Provide public services that enrich the university and its communities.

The CSU houses 12 of the state's 17 MSW programs and 10 of the 14 BSW programs. These programs are located at the following campuses:

MSW Programs
California State University, Bakersfield California State University, Chico California State University, Fresno California State University, Hayward California State University, Long Beach California State University, Los Angeles California State University, Sacramento California State University, San Bernardino California State University, Stanislaus Humboldt State University San Diego State University San Francisco State University San Jose State University
BSW Programs
California State University, Chico California State University, Fresno California State University, Long Beach California State University, Los Angeles California State University, Sacramento California State University, San Bernardino Humboldt State University San Diego State University San Francisco State University San José State University

The CSU has made a major commitment to social work professional education, providing most of the education for social workers on the fourth and sixth rungs of the Ladder of Learning. In addition, in collaboration with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), many CSU social work

programs have coordinated with local county departments of children and family services to provide in-service training to child welfare social workers through a statewide system of training academies. This training provides the education for child welfare social workers on the second and third rungs of the Ladder of Learning. The academies and their partnering campuses are:

- Bay Area Academy at San Francisco State University,
- Central California Child Welfare Training Academy at CSU, Fresno,
- Inter-University Consortium at four universities throughout Los Angeles County (CSU, Long Beach; CSU, Los Angeles; UCLA; and USC),
- Northern California Children & Family Services Training Academy at UC Davis Extension,
- Public Child Welfare Training Academy—Southern Region at San Diego State University, and CSU, San Bernardino.

While these collaborations currently provide training for child welfare social workers only, they could easily be expanded to provide training for social workers in other fields such as mental health, aging, and adult services.

B. Student Enrollment

The data below shows that, at any one time in the CSU system, approximately 1,500 students are studying to become BSW social workers and close to 2,000 students preparing to become MSW social workers. This data also demonstrates the commitment to recruiting a diverse student body and, therefore, promoting a diverse social work workforce. These numbers, although low compared to the need identified in Part I, have climbed significantly over the last few years because of the rapid increase in the number of MSW programs in the CSU system. Five of the 12 MSW programs (Bakersfield, Chico, Hayward, Los Angeles, and Stanislaus) were launched in the last 10 years. One important

area for further study is a cost-benefit analysis of the capacity of current BSW and MSW programs for growth and the capacity of the CSU system to open new BSW and MSW programs. This would include an evaluation of the potential for various forms of distributed learning such as distance learning via two-way compressed video, web-based courses, etc., to facilitate such expansion.

Table 3. Total CSU Enrollments by Ethnicity 2000–2003

	M.S.W. & BSW 2000/1	M.S.W. & BSW 2001/2	M.S.W. & BSW 2002/3	Overall Total
African American/Other Black Non Hispanic	331	339	314	984 (10%)
American Indian/ Native American/Alaskan Native	36	50	31	117 (1%)
Asian American	306	334	344	984 (10%)
Latino/Hispanic	944	1065	1097	3106 (32%)
Pacific Islander	21	25	22	68 (1%)
White/Non Hispanic Caucasian	1183	1199	1103	3485 (36%)
Multiple Race/Ethnic Identity	4	2	2	8 (0.1%)
International Students	7	9	11	27 (0.3%)
Other	143	209	128	480 (5%)
Unknown	214	154	180	548 (6%)
Total	3189	3386	3232	9807 (100%)

Note: This table does not include data from San Francisco State University due to publishing deadlines.

In the current context there is a considerable discrepancy between the CSU production of social workers and the identified need for social workers. As

stated in Part I, the child welfare system in California hires 75% of social workers at either the BSW or MSW levels. The SB 2030 workforce study identified a need for approximately 21,000 child welfare social workers, if caseloads were at optimum levels. If this number represents 75% of the need in the social work workforce, it can be concluded that California needs a total of approximately 28,000 social workers. Currently, the state has approximately 7,000 child welfare social workers; using the same rationale, it can be concluded that there is a total of 9,300 social workers in California. Between the 28,000 needed and the 9,300 actual social workers, California has a shortfall of about 18,700 social workers.

Currently, CSU, which has willingly responded to the social worker need, allocates \$7,407 for each full-time enrolled student. If the shortfall of social workers were to be addressed by the CSU system, the state's least costly university system, it would cost \$138,510,900. Since this allocation is unlikely in the current budget context, the reconceptualization of the role of the MSW and BSW social worker, identified in the Ladder of Learning (Table 2) is offered as a method to address the social work shortfall. BSW social workers need specific responsibilities, while assisted by apprentice and trainee social workers. Then, MSW social workers should take on leadership roles, assisted by BSW social workers, and other social work trainees and apprentices.

C. Organizational Challenges

The CSU system's current priority is to respond to the shortage of qualified teachers and nurses. Because CSU is a major provider of social work

professional education, it should consider responding to the social work shortage as a higher priority. Both CSU's central administration and the systemwide faculty need to be educated and encouraged in this endeavor. In addition, the state Legislature must provide the leadership to establish this priority, just as it has regarding the need for teachers.

At the campus level are various organizational challenges and needs. These are:

- Address the lower rungs of the ladder (First - Third) through articulation agreements, not only with community colleges but also with high schools. Currently, CSU has sound articulation agreements with the Community College system. However, the social work programs have not generally had a major role in these negotiations. More effort is needed in making such agreements. In addition, high school students can be informed of studies that will lead them to social work education in the community colleges and eventually in the CSU. This should be a major thrust of campus outreach programs.
- Review resource needs to expand the current number of BSW and MSW graduates to meet workforce needs.
- Integrate professional training in the academies more closely with university curriculum. Assess training curriculum and trainer credentials through campus review committees so this training can be given university credit.

- Set up collaborative systems across campuses with social work programs, so that not only could student admission be integrated, but faculty workload could be shared.
- Develop further use of technology and off-campus sites for social work education offered through distance learning.

D. Summary Conclusions

- The CSU system houses 70% of the accredited BSW and MSW social work programs in California (12 of the 17 MSW program and 10 of the 14 BSW programs).
- Six of the CSU campuses are members of the statewide academy collaboratives providing training to child welfare social workers throughout California.
- At any one time, approximately 1,500 students in the CSU are studying toward the BSW degree, and 2,000 toward becoming MSW social workers.
- A cost-benefit analysis is needed to determine the capacity of current programs to grow and the capacity of the CSU to open more BSW and MSW programs.
- Currently, approximately 18,700 social workers are needed in California.
- If the CSU were to respond to this need, it would cost \$138,510,900. It is unlikely that funding for expansion of this magnitude will materialize. The Ladder of Learning can be used as a method for meeting the shortfall in professionally trained social workers California.
- CSU needs to be encouraged to make the social work shortage a priority through state legislation.

CHAPTER 5: RESPONSE FROM UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A. Overview

The University of California (UC) offers graduate professional education in social work at two of its nine campuses: UC Berkeley and UCLA. Both campuses also offer doctoral education as well as undergraduate preparation in the field of social welfare. In keeping with the wider mission of the UC, emphasis is placed on preparing graduate social work students for leadership positions in the field. The inculcation of critical assessment skills, the effective use of research findings, and knowledge development are also emphasized.

Although the research emphasis is a primary focus of the doctoral (PhD or DSW) degree at both campuses, the doctoral degree is not narrowly construed as a research qualification, but as a wider preparation for an academic career in the fields of social work and social welfare. Both UC Berkeley and UCLA doctoral graduates generally pursue academic careers, and many have assumed positions of prominence and leadership throughout the country and the world. The doctoral programs at both UC Berkeley and UCLA also make a significant contribution to social work education by producing the doctoral graduates needed to staff the state's other schools of social work.

The Master of Social Welfare (MSW) degree is the only professional qualification in social work offered at UC Berkeley and UCLA. Unlike many CSU campuses and private colleges, professional social work education is not offered at the undergraduate level at UC Berkeley and UCLA. The MSW degree at both institutions is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. Currently,

enrollments in the MSW programs at UC Berkeley and UCLA are at an optimal level; neither seeks to increase enrollments. For both schools, emphasizing the importance of inculcating leadership and critical thinking skills in their professional social work offerings make maintaining manageable enrollments desirable. Similarly, in keeping with the University of California's mission, doctoral education and research are given priority.

The undergraduate offerings at both campuses are intended to provide students with an introduction to the field of social welfare and, in many cases, graduates of these programs proceed to graduate professional programs either at UC Berkeley, UCLA, or at other accredited schools of social work. The undergraduate major in social welfare at UC Berkeley and the undergraduate minor at UCLA may also be viewed as a pre-professional or paraprofessional qualification. In the last few years, both schools of social welfare have taken concrete steps to enhance the paraprofessional elements in the undergraduate degree and, in view of its popularity with undergraduate students, enrollments have been expanded. While many students enrolled in these undergraduate programs pursue graduate professional education in social work, many others view the degree as a suitable introduction to the field and an adequate preparation for their career choices.

B. Student Enrollment

Between 95 and 100 students are admitted annually to each of the MSW programs at UC Berkeley and UCLA. Although numbers fluctuate annually,

between 450 and 500 applications are received each year at each campus. Since the degree requires two years of full-time study, the total enrollment on each campus at any given time is just short of 200. The dropout rate is negligible, and although the programs require full-time study, most students complete their MSW degrees within the specified two years.

The UC Berkeley program offers five major areas of specialization: community mental health services, children and family services, services to older adults, health and social work, and management and planning. The program emphasizes social work practice within public or publicly supported social service settings. The majority of students in the MSW program enroll in either the children and family services or community mental health services specializations. The program has a strong internship component, which requires students to combine their classroom and field preparation for social work practice. Many students begin their careers in "front-line" social work positions but soon move into supervisory and managerial positions. The student body is diverse, with ethnic minorities comprising about a third of total enrollment. The great majority of students (approximately 80%) are women.

The UCLA MSW program is structured similarly to the UC Berkeley program, with some differences. UCLA offers five major areas of specialization: children and families, mental health, aging, health, and the non-profit sector. The program prepares students for leadership positions in the public and non-profit social services sectors. While a majority of students select the children and families or mental health specializations, a growing number are enrolling in the

aging specialization. As at UC Berkeley, a strong internship component combines classroom and field preparation. Because so many graduates move from front-line to supervisory and managerial positions, the UCLA program increasingly emphasizes leadership preparation. Ethnic minorities comprise nearly half the master's program enrollment; 85% of students are female.

The undergraduate major in social welfare at UC Berkeley admits approximately 130 students per year. These are upper-division students who have completed the prerequisites for the program in their freshman and sophomore years. The program, therefore, has a total enrollment of about 260 students. It was previously capped at 200, but as a part of the enrollment expansion in recent years, the cap was raised by 60 students. The additional slots were filled within a short period, and it is evident that even more students could be accommodated if resources were available. Most of the additional students have been absorbed through expanding the school's summer program.

Since the undergraduate minor at UCLA was established in 1995, it has steadily grown. The minor is schoolwide within the School of Public Policy and Social Research and entails students taking courses in social welfare, urban planning, and policy studies. Of the more than 3,100 students taking courses in the minor, over half are enrolled in social welfare courses. Of the approximately 300 undergraduates annually petitioning for the minor, about half choose the social welfare "cluster" or substantive focus. It is apparent that an interest in social welfare curriculum and issues has driven the growth of the minor, and the

Department of Social Welfare is committed to expanding its course offerings and teaching faculty in the next two years.

The doctoral program at UC Berkeley currently has an enrollment of about 55 students. About eight students are admitted each year, although in recent years the numbers have been somewhat higher. Approximately 50 applications are received each year. Most of those admitted already have an MSW, but a few students are concurrently admitted to the MSW and doctoral programs so they may obtain the professional qualification before proceeding to doctoral study. The school attracts a large proportion of applications from other parts of the United States and other countries. In recent years, applications from international students have increased significantly. The PhD program at UC Berkeley has a strong reputation based on the scholarly record of its faculty and the achievements of its graduates and, as indicated earlier, only a few applications to the PhD degree can be admitted. Although graduates of the UC Berkeley PhD are currently employed in many different parts of the country and, indeed, in the world, a significant number have found employment at other universities in California.

The doctoral program at UCLA is similar in size and character to that at UC Berkeley. Annual admissions have grown from 6 to 9 students to 10 to 12 students. Annual applications range from 45 to 55 students. While most applicants enter the program with an MSW, a growing number enter the MSW-PhD program and acquire an MSW to better prepare themselves for teaching and research in social work. Applications are received from throughout the

United States and, like UC Berkeley, international applicants, especially from Asia, have increased. With growing frequency, graduates of UCLA's doctoral program are employed by top-tier social work programs nationally. A significant number choose to remain in the state and are eagerly recruited as faculty in social work programs.

C. Organizational Challenges

Currently, graduate level professional social work education (the MSW degree) at both UC Berkeley and UCLA is regarded as optimal in size. Neither program is eager to expand its master's level enrollments, and both believe that the balance between graduate level professional social work education, undergraduate education, and doctoral education is appropriate, given their current mission and existing patterns of resource allocation. Both programs are heavily engaged in research projects of a great variety that inform social work practice, policy development, and human service programs throughout the state and the nation. These activities are well funded by federal and state agencies and private foundations. In addition to supporting doctoral research activities, both programs have sizable research staff that support faculty research initiatives. Both attract numerous national and international scholars who pursue their own research agendas in these programs. UC Berkeley and UCLA, keenly mindful of their role in preparing graduate-level professional social workers, have additional obligations in research, which are both crucial to preparing doctoral students and intertwined with their educational mission. Both programs believe

that current enrollments are appropriate to their overall role in preparing future faculty, conducting research, and contributing to knowledge development in the field.

Nevertheless, as was noted earlier, the UC Berkeley's School of Social Welfare has, in recent years, increased its undergraduate enrollment commensurate with the campuswide enrollment expansion initiatives. Total enrollment in the undergraduate major has recently been increased by 60 students. This expansion was approved and supported by the university administration. Although it is conceivable that additional undergraduate students could be accommodated in the major, additional resources would be needed, primarily additional faculty, if this is to be seriously contemplated. The school's efforts to enhance the potential of the undergraduate major to produce paraprofessionals who can alleviate the social work shortage in California have been augmented by a successful link between the university and community colleges, which now supply an annual cohort of students who transfer to the program. Many are from ethnic minority and immigrant backgrounds, who indicate that they greatly value the opportunity to transfer from a community college to this program. Most of them successfully complete the requirements of the degree.

The School of Social Welfare at UC Berkeley is also extensively engaged in statewide efforts to promote the contributions the social work profession can make to public social services. The school administers the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), which works closely with the state and

county social services administrations, as well as UCLA's Department of Social Welfare, the California State University programs, and two private social work programs, to recruit and deploy more professionally qualified staff in public child welfare. It is now expanding into related social service fields such as mental health and services to older adults, with future plans for expansion into school social work and developmental disabilities. The school was also an active participant in the hearings convened by the Assembly Human Services Committee on the shortage of social workers in California and in the production of several reports on this issue, which have informed the current planning exercise. Its role in supporting these and other initiatives is appropriate to its role and mission and complements its research and teaching programs.

As reported previously, the Department of Social Welfare at UCLA has dramatically increased its enrollments and course offerings in the undergraduate policy minor, a trend that is certain to continue. The department has also modestly increased its doctoral enrollments over time in acknowledgment of the growing need for doctoral-prepared faculty to teach in social work programs in California. The department continues to attract applicants to its joint master's programs with policy studies, law, public health, and Asian American studies, while also seeking new opportunities to educate undergraduate and master's-level students across disciplinary and professional boundaries. UCLA's Department of Social Welfare also administers the Inter-University Consortium on Child Welfare, which works with Los Angeles County's Department of Children & Family Services and the other three social work programs in the

county (CSU, Los Angeles; CSU, Long Beach; and the University of Southern California) to prepare social workers for service in child welfare services and to assess the impact of those services. UCLA faculty also continue to collaborate with their colleagues at UC Berkeley in actively participating in state and regional hearings on child welfare, aging, and mental health, and addressing the persistent shortage of social workers in the human services in California.

D. Summary Conclusions

- The UC system offers social work education for undergraduate, MSW, and PhD social workers at UC Berkeley and UCLA.
- Approximately 200 students are currently studying social work at the undergraduate level, 400 students at the MSW programs, and 50 students at the PhD level.
- These programs do not have plans to grow.
- They are heavily engaged in social work research and contributing to the faculty needs at other universities in the state.
- The UC Berkeley undergraduate degree (which is not an accredited BSW) and the UCLA undergraduate social welfare minor aim to produce paraprofessionals who can contribute to alleviating the social work shortage.

CHAPTER 6: RESPONSE FROM INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES

A. Overview

Five private universities in California provide education that corresponds to rungs three through seven of the Ladder of Learning, through BSW, MSW, and PhD degree programs, and professional trainings:

PhD Programs Loma Linda University University of Southern California
MSW Programs <i>Azusa Pacific University (in candidacy with the Council on Social Work Education)</i> Loma Linda University University of Southern California
BSW Programs Azusa Pacific University La Sierra University Pacific Union College Whittier College

B. Student Enrollment

As independent institutions, each is unique in its mission and contribution to social work education in California. Following is an overview of each of the academic units that represent these five institutions:

Azusa Pacific University

Information available:

Sally Alonzo Bell, PhD, LCSW
Chair and Professor
Phone: (626) 815 5487
E-mail: sbell@apu.edu

La Sierra University

La Sierra University has a BSW program, accredited by the Council on Social Work Education since 1979. Two avenues exist for obtaining the BSW: a day program that meets the needs of traditional students and an evening adult degree program designed to meet the needs of older, non-traditional students. The average enrollment for both the traditional day program and evening adult degree program is 70 students. Approximately 50% of the BSW students at La Sierra University are non-traditional students enrolled in the evening adult degree program. La Sierra's BSW program graduates 9 to 17 students each year. With the current number of full-time faculty, the program could accommodate up to 75 students, or approximately a 7% increase in enrollment.

Loma Linda University

Current programs include a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Case Management, MSW Program (Clinical Social Work & Policy/Administration), and a PhD in Social Policy and Social Research. A post-master's certificate in Forensic Science is jointly offered by Social Work and the School of Medicine for individuals who have already completed or are concurrently enrolled in an MS or PhD program in one of the physical sciences. In addition to these programs, the University Board of Trustees has approved the development of a PhD in Clinical Social Work and a professional Doctorate in Public Administration.

An enduring challenge for the department is the ability to recruit faculty who possess both the MSW and PhD. Another area of growing concern is the

inability of employers to provide release time for employees wishing to attend school on a part-time basis.

The MSW program currently graduates 30 to 35 students each year. The PhD program is expected to graduate its first class in June 2005. Both the MSW and PhD programs continue to experience growth. As of fall 2003, there were 102 MSW students (full-time and part-time combined) and 13 PhD candidates. The enrollment for fall 2003 indicated a 25% increase in the MSW program and a 33% increase in the PhD program. Given the current faculty, both programs have additional growth capacity of at least 33% before additional faculty would be necessary.

Pacific Union College

Pacific Union College (PUC) has a BSW program, accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. Over the past few years, the university has been working to improve access to this program for part-time, working students. To facilitate this, PUC has received approval from the Council on Social Work Education and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to offer a BSW at Napa County Health and Human Services. This is still in the planning stages. The target for this satellite program is human services workers; however, students from the surrounding community were also encouraged to enroll. To support this, Napa Community College has worked closely with PUC to have their Human Service graduates continue on in the BSW program.

At any one time, the program has approximately 29 students supported by two full-time equivalent and one part-time faculty. Enrollment could be

augmented if Title IV-E funds were made available to support BSW students. The program continues to work closely with community colleges and other community agencies. The BSW program is the only program of its type in surrounding Napa, Sonoma, Solano, and Sonoma counties. This diverse area includes a large population of migrant workers and other at-risk populations, which is why Napa County HHS wants to “grow its own” by educating workers already in the system. Sonoma County also wants to replicate the proposed program. Rural Lake County has an extremely difficult time recruiting social workers to deal with its significant social problems. Any significant change in the BSW program would require “outside” financial support (at least for start-up costs).

University of Southern California

Information Available:

Marilyn Flynn, PhD
Dean, School of Social Work
University Park Campus
Montgomery Ross Fisher Building
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0411
Phone: (213) 740-2711
E-mail: mflynn@usc.edu

Whittier College

Information Available:

Paula Sheridan, PhD
Chair, Department of Social Work
Whittier College
13406 Philadelphia
P.O. Box 634
Whittier, CA 90608-0634
Phone: (562) 907-4200
E-mail: psheridan@whittier.edu

C. Summary Conclusions

- Independent universities contribute to social work education at the undergraduate, MSW, and PhD levels.
- Additional funding would be needed to expand their role in social work education.

CHAPTER 7: RESPONSE FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A. Overview

Community Colleges in California are publicly supported and locally oriented colleges that offer programs for transfer to a four-year college, career education programs, and remedial programs. They also provide opportunities for cultural growth, life enrichment, skill improvement, and continuing education. Students enter community colleges with a variety of purposes, such as transfer, degree or certificate attainment, job training, skill development, or lifelong learning; these goals are dynamic over time as students persist through the programs. Income and prior educational backgrounds vary enormously. One of the most common reasons for attending a community college is “upward career mobility.”

California has the resources of 108 community college campuses located around the state, in both rural and large metropolitan areas. For example, the Los Angeles Community College District has nine campuses. All California community colleges offer courses that meet lower-division (first two years) requirements of a four-year college or university and report data to the Chancellor’s Office. Data for 2001–2002 indicate that:

- 53.9% of community college students are women;
- 56.8% are members of ethnic minority groups (including Asian/Pacific Islander, Filipino, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian);
- 16.7% are between the ages of 30 and 39;

- 23.0% are 40+;
- 25.0% are under age 20;
- 35.3% are between the ages of 20 and 29;
- 23,673 certificates (non-categorized) are conferred;
- 69,805 students received AA degrees (non-categorized);
- 62,764 transferred to the CSU or UC system (non-categorized).

The California Community Colleges offer a variety of services for special student populations. These programs are designed to enhance student equity, access, retention, persistence toward education goal completion, and successful outcome. A comprehensive array of student support services is available to students through the Extended Opportunities Program and Services (EOPS), Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE), Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), and CalWORKS programs. Their purpose is to provide the necessary assistance for students to succeed and achieve their educational goals.

Community college students whose interests are in psychology and/or child development have expressed a desire or need for more course work focused on human services as a pathway to university or college upper-division work leading to a BA/BS in social work. To meet this emerging need for effective front-line workers in child and family welfare (social work), a few community colleges, for example, Canada College, College of San Mateo, and Cabrillo College, are developing full-fledged human services certificate programs.

B. Summary Conclusions

- The community college environment is rich for recruitment in the health and human services field.
- Until recently, students interested in human services as a career were limited to trying to find a community college that offered this major.
- There was a sprinkling of courses/programs throughout the state, though similar requirements and standards for completion were inconsistent among programs. Generally speaking, those courses were supported by one or two campus "champions" and were not part of ongoing/regular course offerings.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. (1985). BSW programs and the continuum in social work. *Journal of Social Work Education, 21*(3), 63-72.
- Barth, M. C. & Pho, Y. (2001). *The labor market for social workers: A first look*. Retrieved April 19, 2004 from <http://www.cswe.org/projects/outreach/laborstudy.htm>.
- California Department of Social Services, Data Analysis and Publications. (2003). *Facts at a glance*. Retrieved February 14, 2004, from <http://www.cwsredesign.ca.gov/res/pdf/facts.pdf>.
- The California Endowment. (2003). *Demand likely to outstrip available mental health workforce in California*. Retrieved April 19, 2004, from <http://www.hivandhepatitis.com/health/020703.html>.
- Equality California. (2003). AB 205 fact sheet. Retrieved February 14, 2004, from http://www.equa.org/docs/factsheet_ab205.pdf.
- Gross, G. (1992). A defining moment: The social work continuum revisited. *Journal of Social Work Education, 28*, 110-118.
- Hoffman, K. (1992). Should we support the continuum in social work education? Yes. *Journal of Social Work Education, 28*, 6-10.
- Hopkins, K. M. & Mudrick, N. R. (1999). Impact of university/agency partnerships in child welfare on organizations, workers and work activity. *Child Welfare, 78*(6), 749-774
- Jansson, B. (2003). *Becoming an effective policy advocate*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Levin, R., & Herbert, M. (1995). Differential work assignments of social work practitioners in hospitals. *Health and Social Work, 20*(1), 21-31.
- Neustrom, A., & Barr, B. (2001). *The prospects of expanding professional social work programs in California*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare.
- National Association of Social Workers. (2003). Deprofessionalization and declassification. In National Association of Social Workers, *Social work speaks: National Association of Social Workers policy statements* (pp. 75-78). Washington, DC: Author.

- Pasztor, E. M., Saint-Germain, M., & DeCrescenzo, T. (2002). *Demand for social workers in California*. Retrieved February 14, 2004, from: http://www.csus.edu/calst/Government_Affairs/faculty_fellows_program.html.
- Raymond, G., & Atherton, C. (1991). Blue smoke and mirrors: The continuum in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 27*, 297-304.
- Rittner, B. & Wodarski, J. S. (1999). Differential uses for B.S.W. and M.S.W. educated social workers in child welfare services. *Children and Youth Services Review, 21*(3), 217-238.
- Rycus, J. & Hughes, R. (1998). *The field guide to child welfare: Child development* (Vol. III). Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Scharlach, A., Simon, J. S., & Dal Santo, T. S. (2002). *Aging of California's baby boomers: Implications for state policies, programs and personnel*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare.
- Theriot, M. (2000). *CSWE-accredited social work programs in California: A graphic presentation of statistics and data*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare.
- Theriot, M. (2001). *Non-professional social work and human services programs in California*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare.
- Tracy, E., & Pine, B. (2000). Child welfare education and training: Future trends and influences. *Child Welfare, 79*(1), 93-114.
- Wattenberg, E. (1986). The fate of baby boomers and their children. *Social Work, 31*(1), 20-28.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

California State University BSW and MSW Program Enrollment

California State University: BSW Program Enrollments

	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
2000/1	89	300	M/D	210	98	368	N/A	158	M/D	171	1,394
2001/2	82	250	M/D	243	117	351	N/A	178	M/D	149	1,370
2002/3	77	217	M/D	265	104	349	N/A	162	M/D	165	1,339
Fall/2003	M/D	350	M/D	M/D	119	378	22 ²	M/D	M/D	M/D	869

California State University: MSW Program Enrollments

	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF	CSUHY	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSUST	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
2000/1	50	N/A	178	0	N/A	560	128	182	120	323	M/D	254	1,795
2001/2	52	21	188	0	84	619	140	146	127	374	M/D	265	2,016
2002/3	41	61	176	0	71	534	76	122	126	373	M/D	313	1,893
Fall/2003	MD	62	178	58³	108	625	127	163	125	MD	M/D	MD	1,446

N/A = not applicable, M/D = missing data,

CSUB=CSU, Bakersfield
 CSUC=CSU, Chico
 CSUF=CSU, Fresno
 CSUH=CSU, Humboldt
 CSUHY=CSU, Hayward
 CSULA=Cal State Los Angeles
 CSULB=CSU, Long Beach
 CSUS=CSU, Sacramento
 CSUSB=CSU, San Bernardino
 CSUST=CSU, Stanislaus
 SDSU=San Diego State
 SFSU=San Francisco State
 SJSU=San Jose State

² This program opened in fall 2003

³ This program opened in fall 2003

APPENDIX B

California State University BSW Program Racial/Ethnic Data

Academic Year 2000–2001

	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American / Other Black / Non-Hispanic	4	30		35	11	49	N/A	17	33	10	156
American Indian / Native American / Alaskan Native	0	4		0	0	4	N/A	1	1	1	10
Asian American	4	4		29	9	40	N/A	20	37	42	148
Mexican American	0	150		116	43	38	N/A	55	30	76	478
Puerto Rican	0	0		0	0	2	N/A	0	0	0	2
Other Latino / Hispanic	17	0		0	0	12	N/A	11	34	0	40
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0	16	N/A	0	15	1	17
White / Non-Hispanic Caucasian	52	50		10	31	180	N/A	36	43	32	391
Multiple Race / Ethnicity	0	0		0	4	0	N/A	0	0	0	4
Foreign (Not Resident USA)	1	0		0	0	0	N/A	2	10	0	3
Other	0	36		8	0	7	N/A	16	17	0	67
Unknown	11	26		12	0	20	N/A	0	18	9	78
Total	89	300		210	98	368	0	158	238	171	1394

*N/A = not applicable

Academic Year 2001–2002

	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American / Other Black / Non-Hispanic	3	24		39	19	43	N/A	17	41	10	155
American Indian / Native American / Alaskan Native	0	2		3	0	3	N/A	0	2	2	10
Asian American	6	28		15	19	33	N/A	20	25	30	151
Mexican American	8	116		141	53	30	N/A	65	18	69	482
Puerto Rican	0	1		0	0	6	N/A	0	1	0	7
Other Latino / Hispanic	6	7		0	0	10	N/A	13	33	0	36
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0	20	N/A	0	10	0	20
White / Non-Hispanic Caucasian	52	49		17	22	182	N/A	45	44	29	396
Multiple Race / Ethnicity	0	0		0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	0
Foreign (No Resident U.S.A.)	0	0		0	0	0	N/A	4	9	0	4
Other	2	3		8	0	7	N/A	14	7	0	34
Unknown	5	20		20	4	17	N/A	0	13	9	75
Total	82	250	0	243	117	351	0	178	203	149	1370

*N/A = not applicable

Academic Year 2002–2003

	CSUC	CSUF	HSU	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American / Other Black / Non-Hispanic	3	17		43	17	36	N/A	13	34	10	139
American Indian / Native American / Alaskan Native	2	0		0	0	2	N/A	0	3	2	6
Asian American	7	39		20	9	35	N/A	21	29	27	158
Mexican American	5	96		157	42	37	N/A	55	25	74	466
Puerto Rican	0	0		0	0	5	N/A	0	1	0	5
Other Latino / Hispanic	2	0		0	3	10	N/A	7	33	0	22
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	4	14	N/A	0	12	0	18
White / Non-Hispanic Caucasian	55	37		19	18	179	N/A	50	37	37	395
Multiple Race / Ethnicity	0	0		0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	0
Foreign (No Resident U.S.A.)	1	0		0	0	0	N/A	2	11	0	3
Other	2	3		10	9	18	N/A	14	7	0	56
Unknown	0	25		16	2	13	N/A	0	14	15	71
Total	77	217	0	265	104	349	0	162	206	165	1339

*N/A = not applicable

Academic Year Fall 2003

	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American / Other Black / Non-Hispanic	MD	30		MD	11	42	5	MD		MD	88
American Indian / Native American / Alaskan Native	MD	3		MD	1	1	1	MD		MD	6
Asian American	MD	72		MD	23	43	1	MD		MD	139
Mexican American	MD	164		MD	33	47	5	MD		MD	249
Puerto Rican	MD	0		MD	0	5	0	MD		MD	5
Other Latino / Hispanic	MD	5		MD	5	7	0	MD		MD	16
Pacific Islander	MD	0		MD	3	20	0	MD		MD	23
White / Non-Hispanic Caucasian	MD	65		MD	20	190	4	MD		MD	279
Multiple Race / Ethnicity	MD	0		MD	0	0	0	MD		MD	0
Foreign (No Resident U.S.A.)	MD	0		MD	0	0	0	MD		MD	0
Other	MD	0		MD	11	10	2	MD		MD	23
Unknown	MD	11		MD	12	13	4	MD		MD	40
Total	0	350	0	0	119	378	22	0	0	0	869

*MD = Missing Data

APPENDIX C
California State University MSW Program Racial/Ethnic Data

Academic Year 2000–2001

	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH*	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSUSTAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American/Other Black/non Hispanic	3	n/a	16		n/a	54	20	30	13	15	32	24	175
American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native	3	n/a	1		n/a	8	3	1	2	5	4	3	26
Asian American	1	n/a	3		n/a	56	14	7	12	29	24	36	158
Mexican American	14	n/a	63		n/a	135	16	39	20	47	15	69	403
Puerto Rican	0	n/a	0		n/a	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1
Other Latino/Hispanic	0	n/a	0		n/a	0	5	0	0	15	18	0	20
Pacific Islander	0	n/a	0		n/a	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4
White/Non-Hispanic Caucasian	29	n/a	71		n/a	218	60	97	58	164	43	95	792
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	0	n/a	0		n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foreign (no resident visa)	0	n/a	0		n/a	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	4
Other	0	n/a	24		n/a	0	3	2	4	43	4	0	76
Unknown	0	n/a	0		n/a	89	6	6	10	0	11	25	136
Total	50	n/a	178		n/a	560	128	182	120	323	166	254	1795

*CSU Hayward to begin MSW Program in fall 2003. They have accepted 58 students out of approximately 200 applications.
n/a = not applicable

Academic Year 2001–2002

	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH*	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSUSTAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American/Other Black/non Hispanic	12	1	14		13	61	19	14	11	17	41	22	184
American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0	3		1	6	3	0	5	17	4	5	40
Asian American	3	1	21		12	56	10	5	11	31	24	33	183
Mexican American	11	0	70		43	154	13	20	21	79	17	78	489
Puerto Rican	0	0	0		0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Other Latino/Hispanic	0	0	6		0	0	6	14	10	12	20	0	48
Pacific Islander	0	0	0		0	0	3	0	0	0	7	2	5
White/Non-Hispanic Caucasian	26	19	58		12	234	65	70	65	160	43	94	803
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	0	0	0		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Foreign (no resident visa)	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	5
Other	0	0	5		1	106	8	2	0	53	4	0	175
Unknown	0	0	11		0	0	13	21	3	0	13	31	79
Total	52	21	188		84	619	140	146	127	374	182	265	2016

*CSU Hayward to begin MSW Program in fall 2003. They have accepted 58 students out of approximately 200 applications.

Academic Year 2002–2003

	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH*	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSUSTAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American/Other Black/non Hispanic	6	2	17		6	66	16	11	11	17	48	23	175
American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0	4		1	3	2	1	4	4	1	6	25
Asian American	4	2	19		10	53	12	4	11	29	32	42	186
Mexican American	8	5	62		32	144	15	27	31	82	15	90	496
Puerto Rican	0	0	2		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Other Latino/Hispanic	0	2	14		0	45	6	0	12	25	21	0	104
Pacific Islander	0	0	1		0	0	2	0	0	1	11	0	4
White/Non-Hispanic Caucasian	23	45	46		20	190	3	54	50	168	60	109	708
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	0	0	0		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Foreign (no resident visa)	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	8
Other	0	1	0		0	0	5	23	4	39	10	0	72
Unknown	0	4	11		0	31	15	2	3	0	18	43	109
Total	41	61	176		71	534	76	122	126	373	217	313	1893

*CSU Hayward to begin MSW Program in fall 2003. They have accepted 58 students out of approximately 200 applications.

Academic Year Fall 2003

	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF	CSUH*	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSUSTAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	Total
African American/Other Black/non Hispanic	MD	1	15		11	71	15	37	12	MD		MD	162
American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native	MD	0	0		0	6	0	3	1	MD		MD	10
Asian American	MD	3	14		11	64	12	7	11	MD		MD	122
Mexican American	MD	6	82		35	149	17	30	27	MD		MD	346
Puerto Rican	MD	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	MD		MD	1
Other Latino/Hispanic	MD	2	3		7	48	7	9	12	MD		MD	88
Pacific Islander	MD	0	0		5	10	0	1	0	MD		MD	16
White/Non-Hispanic Caucasian	MD	49	63		18	215	50	59	55	MD		MD	509
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	MD	0	0		2	6	0	0	0	MD		MD	8
Foreign (no resident visa)	MD	0	0		0	3	0	0	0	MD		MD	3
Other	MD	1	0		0	10	10	17	1	MD		MD	39
Unknown	MD	0	1	58*	19	42	16	0	6	MD		MD	84
Total	MD	62	178	58*	108	625	127	163	125	MD		MD	1446

*CSU Hayward to begin MSW Program in fall 2003. They have accepted 58 students out of approximately 200 applications.

**MD = Missing Data

APPENDIX D

Admissions Data for California State University BSW and MSW Programs

California State University, BSW Program Enrollment and Graduation Data, AY 2000/2001–Fall 2003

Academic Year 2000–2001	CSUC	CSUF	Humboldt State Univ.	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	88	MD		210	85	MD	N/A	101		79	563
Number Admitted	88	349		107	51	89	N/A	61		37	782
Number of Graduates	33	349		139	97	112	N/A	49		59	838

Academic Year 2001–2002	CSUC	CSUF	Humboldt State Univ.	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	82	MD		243	88	MD	N/A	138		95	646
Number Admitted	82	333		140	51	98	N/A	69		47	826
Number of Graduates	45	333		140	74	124	N/A	69		50	835

Academic Year 2002–2003	CSUC	CSUF	Humboldt State Univ.	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	86	MD		235	99	MD	N/A	109		93	622
Number Admitted	86	327		152	74	104	N/A	53		51	847
Number of Graduates	49	327		135	74	126	N/A	70		37	818

Academic Year 2003–2004	CSUC	CSUF	Humboldt State Univ.	CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	MD	MD		MD	86	MD	27	MD		MD	113
Number Admitted	MD	351		MD	63	112	22	MD		MD	548

*MD = Missing Data

California State University, MSW Program Enrollment and Graduation Data, AY 2000/2001–Fall 2003

Academic Year 2000–2001	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF		CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSU STAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	63	N/A	121		MD	300	359	275	101	321		258	1798
Number Admitted	50	N/A	78		MD	164	128	94	59	160		205	938
Number Graduated	N/A	N/A	59		18	215	110	67	36	124		92	721

Academic Year 2001–2002	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF		CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSU STAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	68	132	131		189	370	385	139	91	328		242	2075
Number Admitted	52	21	95		114	273	138	49	46	175		172	1135
Number Graduated	12	N/A	77		43	133	127	64	48	98		76	678

Academic Year 2002–2003	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF		CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSU STAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	53	102	142		297	366	397	169	124	370		310	2330
Number Admitted	44	37	84		132	253	135	65	74	169		212	1205
Number Graduated	35	32	69		MD	154	129	54	31	101		106	711

Academic Year 2003–2004	CSUB	CSUC	CSUF		CSULA	CSULB	CSUS	CSUSB	CSU STAN	SDSU	SFSU	SJSU	TOTAL
Number of Applicants	MD	96	128		413	408	MD	194	82	425		398	2144
Number Admitted	MD	38	72		136	286	127	87	41	145		238	1170

*CSUH to begin MSW Program in fall 2003. They have accepted 58 students out of approximately 200 applicants.

** N/A – Not applicable

***MD = Missing Data