



CalSWEC

California Social Work Education Center

Evaluation and Research Committee		
Date: October 18, 2018	Time: 1:15PM – 3:45PM	Location: Sheraton LAX
Attendees	David Chenot, E. Maxwell Davis, Jeffrey Edleson, Kari Beurman, Peter Allen Lee, Michael Sumner, Elizabeth Newby, Debra Waters-Roman, Virginia Rondero Hernandez	
Agenda/Topics		
	Discussion of revised permanent committee description	

Discussion	
Major Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gave a welcome and introduction to the purpose of the committee meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed the history and background to the changes in the committee descriptions and the renaming from R&E to E&R. Emphasis from CalSWEC is the evaluation and applied research, not traditional pure research. Actually, more evaluation is needed, especially in the new grants and programs that CalSWEC manages. This also included the background of the removal of IRB requirement and emphasis on research given the emphasis on evaluation and development to support the Counties, rather than any interest in publication and formal research. If publication is desired later, IRB can be obtained at that time for data as “secondary data.”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For context, reviewed major projects currently that are formally evaluated, including: (1) Title IV-E Stipend Project (BASW and MSW) via student surveys at baseline entry, graduation, middle of employment obligation, end of employment obligation, and 2 years post obligation; (2) MHSa Stipend; (3) HRSA BHWET; (4) OUD supplement to the HRSA BHWET; (5) new Aging Stipend [similar strategies of questions, outcomes, and timepoints of which some are retrospective given when evaluation was done or not done initially]; (6) HRSA grant for Latinx Center of Excellence (regarding mental health); (7) In-Service Training and Common Corps, CSEC, etc.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Read the new description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback and Proposed new items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Can there be inclusion of CADD-sponsored awards for student research projects, which usually has 10-15 submissions each year. Will this be moved back to CADD? Substantial amount of work ended up done by CalSWEC, but could be feasible if committee took responsibility for this instead of staff. CADD supplies the funds and NASW is the fiscal agent. Emphasize the use this group as an advisory group given the talent in the room. Where would “data asks” such as enrollment and admissions for social work programs come from? Is this under the purview of this committee? CalSWEC can try to provide some support for basic data if it is more feasible for CalSWEC staff to do it, based on available discretionary resources. For point #4, add the “QA” loop; sharing and dissemination to inform the system. Have committee encourage stakeholders to reply to data and survey asks. Explain differentiation between CADD and this committee – what research is going to be helpful in CalSWEC that is not thoroughly academic in nature? Get more county and state representation to provide input to see what is helpful in terms of research and their research needs, and see if they can fund these needs. [Previously there were research funds for pilot applied projects such as the Field Education Model grant, which funds are no longer available given funding restrictions] Given CalSWEC and IV-E dollars are not available, develop collaborative grants among county, state, non-profit, and other stakeholders. The range and wealth of experience would be very attractive as well as networking to find available funding.



CalSWEC

California Social Work Education Center

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many attendees are here to find out what the committee does.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People would be excited to come back to this committee if... (1) could see an expanded view through this committee rather than a relatively siloed view (i.e., beyond child welfare); (2) be able to ask relevant questions to their position (county reps) experience, i.e., “How are Online Programs fairing and how do they compare with on-campus, also same question for part-time programs, and advanced standing programs.” (3) have more county and state representation to provide input about research questions needing to be answered;
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to understand better “What is CalSWEC-y?” What are activities that are part of CalSWEC, and what is not? Great projects can still be proposed, but perhaps it will fall under purview of the universities. Identify what is clearly CalSWEC-y for which they can take the lead.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are effective ways to train CWS workers? Consideration of other models (i.e., USC) for child welfare training. One portion (i.e., 2 days of internship) is CWS and other portion (i.e., 1 day) was time in mental health setting. Would this model work for other fields of practice, i.e., sending mental health students to a child welfare setting.

Conclusions

- In general, given feedback, the revised statement is acceptable
- The points listed are comprehensive and general enough to serve as a functional statement

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Share ideas gathered to the CalSWEC Executive Committee and Advisory Board	Peter Allen Lee	10/19/2018
Ask Board for decision regarding suggested edits to the committee description	?	?
As a priority, invite county, state representatives, and other key stakeholders to this committee so as to enlarge the network for future steps	?	?