



CalSWEC

California Social Work Education Center

Leadership. Partnership. Workforce Development.

Evaluation and Research Committee		
Date	October 15, 2020	Time 9-11:30 p.m.
		Location Zoom Meeting
Attendees	Kari Beuerman, Shelby Boston, Timothy Bussell, E. Maxwell Davis, Todd Franke, Scott Gruendl, Peter Lee, Carolyn McAllister, Sara Mullen, Stephanie Schneider, Deborah Waters-Roman	
Agenda/Topics		
I	Welcome & Introductions Icebreaker: Share something interesting in your current work environment (a picture, a pet, a child, etc.!) Review of revised committee charter (see attachment)	
II	Approval of Meeting Agenda	
III	Approval of Meeting Minutes of 4-30-20	
IV	Updates: MHS Retrospective study Title IV-E Retrospective study SERVE Project Supplemental evaluation of APS Stipend Program	
V	Discussion: Evaluation and Research during and after COVID 19: What are the existing evaluation and research needs among CalSWEC stakeholders and are there ways members of this committee can help to address those needs? Committee membership and focus: Where do we go from here?	
VI	Open forum: Questions, ideas and updates from attendees	
VII	Adjournment	
Discussion		

Major Points

1. Hosted a welcome and introduction time based on the ice-breaker question.
2. Briefly reviewed the CalSWEC Evaluation and Research Committee Charter.
3. Approval of Meeting agenda. Todd Franke motioned, Debra Waters-Roman seconded.
4. Approval of Meeting minutes. [Note- don't know who motioned or seconded- sorry missed this].
5. Updates by Maxwell Davis.
 - a. MHSA Retrospective study. The white paper will be coming out, multivariate and qualitative analysis are underway.
 - b. Title IV-E Retrospective study. Completed last spring, white paper on CalSWEC website.
 - c. SERVE Project. The RFP is completed, and the Southern Academy was awarded the evaluation professional services project contract.
 - d. APS Stipend Program pilot. Been working on basic program evaluation with SJSU and UC Berkeley programs. Evaluating pre-service, midpoint, and then at the end. Discussion other aspects of evaluation of this program.
 - e. BHWET. Final year of evaluation work for this project. There is an RFP for renewing the BHWET program, and will apply.
6. Discussion.
 - a. Wanting to know about the research base for the effectiveness of remote instruction. Expectation of larger, more permanent shifts in how we offer training and education, and what to understand the impacts of these changes.
 - b. Sara Mullen wondered about the possibility of doing more formal evaluations of the training academies, particularly given the changes in training formats.
 - c. Discussed the needs for evaluation of clients and employees in remote and telehealth situations. Kari Beuerman discussed the impacts of virtual work. With youth, it can be positive, particularly if there was a prior relationship, due to the skills and comfort youth have in virtual environments. Scott Gruendl discussed the need to evaluate telehealth in mental health. Mental health crisis referrals increased, steadily higher after a massive increase in April and May. Overall, some clients report liking telehealth, while others do not like it and may be avoiding mental health treatment. Feels people are responding less positively to telehealth over time. Wonder about the capacity of agencies to continue to offer telehealth in the future, what schedules will look like. Other community partners agreed that employees will seek increased flexibility in schedules, but it is uncertain how this impacts employees and/ or clientele. Mix of positive (schedule and flexibility) and negative (struggles with privacy, access to internet, etc.) for employees. Maxwell noted there are RFPs coming out on COVID-19 intervention implementation evaluation, but not yet on intervention evaluation. Bay Area Social Service Consortium is very interested in intervention evaluation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Several schools discussed the capacity of students to participate in evaluations or needs assessments. Peter Lee at SJSU discussed the student possibilities of including these kinds of projects in their research projects. Todd Franke at UCLA felt students would be interested in data available for analysis for projects, but that they make their decisions in Septembers. Stephanie Schneider at CSUSB noted students' concerns with digital recruitment of subjects, and the challenges of getting data sets in the local area. Mary Rawlings at APU noted several student projects focused on these issues are in the works, and would be happy to share this information when completed. e. Evaluation opportunities of client populations that were not historically using services in the past. Kari Beuerman noted the Great Plates program, where seniors can have meals brought to them from local restaurants. This brought a clientele to the county that had not been served before. Note many unmet needs of this population, and would like to see how social workers could assess for needs and provide interventions to this population. Possibilities for nontraditional internships was discussed. Debra Waters-Roman noted USC student interns are working with schools to address some of these unmet needs. f. The need to further train social workers for disaster management, to act as primary and secondary responders. Peter Lee and Mary Rawlins agreed this would be good areas to invest in with schools. Shelby Boston from Butte County noted they have been collaborating with Chico State University to offer this training as part of social work internships, and coupled it with Americorps funding. Some ideas for training needs include emergency management, incident command, work in recovery. All agreed this is an area of need, both for agencies and social work programs. g. Timothy Bussell noted a concern for how well prepared students currently in remote internships are for work in the field.
--	--

Conclusions

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline