Re-Envisioning Social Work Education: Building and Living a Social Justice-focused Clinical Social Work Curriculum

Hye-Kyung Kang

Abstract: *Social justice is a central principle of the social work profession and education. However, it can become a hollow ideal unless it is specifically addressed in all applications of social work practice. Scholars have long questioned the social work profession's commitment to putting social justice into practice. Clinical social work has been particularly criticized for its lack of attention to social justice and for failing to address the concerns of the oppressed by relying on individual intervention while overlooking system-level changes. Given that clinical social work is the largest specialization in social work practice, clinical social work programs must re-envision their curriculum to fully address this criticism and educate future social workers to pursue social justice at all levels of practice. This paper presents the collective work of the social work faculty at a clinical social work program to construct a social justice-focused clinical social work curriculum, which culminated in a statement on social justice commitment in their curriculum, illustrates the iterative process of this work, and discusses the lessons from this experience. Implications include the importance of shared understanding of social justice and articulating how it operates in all aspects of social work practice as well as in social work pedagogy.*

Keywords: *Social justice, social work education, clinical social work, social work curriculum*

Social justice is a central principle of the social work profession and education (Council on Social Work Education [CSWE], 2015; International Federation of Social Workers [IFSW], 2018; National Association of Social Workers [NASW], 2021). However, scholars have long questioned the profession's commitment to putting social justice values into practice (Bowles & Hopps, 2014; Corley & Young, 2018; McLaughlin, 2009; Schiele & Hopps, 2009). Clinical social work has been particularly criticized for its lack of attention to social justice and for failing to address the concerns of the oppressed (McLaughlin, 2009). One prominent criticism of clinical social work is that it often relies on individual intervention and fails to take on system-level changes or advocacy (Apgar, 2020; Corley & Young, 2018; Epple, 2007).

Despite the criticism, clinical social workers do consider social justice as essential to clinical practice and recognize the connection between social justice, advocacy, and clinical practice (McLaughlin, 2009; Varghese & Kang, 2019). However, extant research on clinical social workers' engagement in advocacy indicate that social workers spend little time for advocacy in practice (McLaughlin, 2009). There are many external barriers to clinical social workers' engagement in advocacy, such as rigid organizational structures, constricting job descriptions, and experiences of marginalization within organizations when social workers do engage in advocacy (McLaughlin, 2009). Another barrier seems

Hye-Kyung Kang, PhD, MSW, Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, Seattle University, Seattle, WA

to be internal. Some clinical social workers in McLaughlin's study were concerned about social justice advocacy taking the focus off individual clients.

This concern evokes the historical macro-micro tension of the social work profession where micro and macro practices are conceptualized as separate domains, creating a false binary for social workers (Epple, 2007; Apgar, 2020). One contributor to this false binary seems to be that practice models and frameworks do not prepare for social work students and practitioners to make a clear link between clinical practice and social justice (McLaughlin, 2009). In fact, one of the most frequent questions that social work faculty receive from social work students is how to apply social justice values in practice at their practicum. Students and practitioners often complain that their clinical supervisors are not apt to explain how their agency work connects to social justice (Garran et al., 2022).

This phenomenon is puzzling since social work scholars and practitioners have been making specific efforts to promote social justice in clinical practice (e.g., Asakura et al., 2020; Fook, 2016; Harrison et al., 2016; Kang, 2013; McLaughlin, 2011; Morgaine & Capous-Desyllas, 2014; Parker, 2003; Swenson, 1998; Varghese & Kang, 2019). One contributor to this challenge may be the ways in which social justice and advocacy are taught in the social work curriculum. Often, social justice is taught in stand-alone courses and advocacy is confined to macro practice courses; they are not fully integrated into clinical courses and the clinical social work curriculum (McLaughlin, 2009; Mehrotra et al., 2017).

Given that clinical social work is the largest specialization in social work practice (Apgar, 2020), clinical social work programs and educators must re-envision their curriculum to fully address this criticism and educate future social workers to specifically integrate social justice at all levels (micro, mezzo, macro) of intervention. Authors such as Apgar (2020), Corley and Young (2018), Epple (2007) and McLaughlin (2009) call for recognizing the interdependence between clinical practice and social justice and situating advocacy as an integral part of clinical social work.

The Seattle University (SU) Social Work Department faculty is answering this call to action by creating a clinical social work curriculum that integrates a clearly delineated set of social justice principles across all courses, taught by all instructors. In the following sections, the collective work of the SU social work faculty to construct a social justice-focused clinical social work curriculum, which culminated in a departmental statement on social justice commitment, is presented, and the iterative process of this work is described. The lessons from building and "living" a social justice-focused clinical social work curriculum and implications for social work education are shared.

Process

The SU Social Work Department faculty had a unique opportunity to re-envision a clinical social work program from a social justice focused and community-based perspective when creating a new MSW program in 2015. Reflecting the social justice principle of the social work profession and the need for equitable clinical care in

marginalized communities, the inaugural director (the author) proposed the following mission for the new program, which was enthusiastically adopted by the faculty in 2016:

> The mission of the SU MSW program is to educate students for social justice-focused and community-based advanced clinical social work practice. The program seeks to advance equity in access to excellent clinical social work practice for historically marginalized populations by preparing competent and effective practitioners who restore, maintain, and enhance human and community well-being with unwavering attention to social and economic justice. The program is committed to respectful engagement and collaboration with community partners in its scholarship, teaching, and service.((Seattle University Master of Social Work Program, n.d., para. 2)

With this mission, the faculty engaged in steadfast work to re-envision clinical social work. This work took an iterative process where the faculty developed the clinical social work curriculum with an explicit focus on social justice, implemented the curriculum, engaged in regular discussions around what social justice-focused and community-based social work meant in application, and shared our continuous research and experience with one another as we revised the curriculum. When the BSW and MSW programs transitioned out of an interdisciplinary department and established an independent department of social work in 2017 the department adopted an expanded department mission statement. While the initial focus was on the explicit curriculum, we also worked to develop the implicit curriculum and departmental policies and processes to be consistent with the social justice mission. This manuscript focuses on the explicit curriculum.

The faculty recognized that this work must be done with intentional dedication of time and energy and that both the process and the product (curriculum) must reflect our social justice values. Therefore, the faculty implemented the following meetings where all full-time faculty participated (and part-time faculty were invited, but not required, to participate):

1) Social Justice meetings and retreats: two initial full-day retreat sessions followed by monthly meetings to continue to develop a shared conceptualization of social justice and to delineate how it is demonstrated in our curriculum and teaching, which culminated in the departmental statement on social justice commitment;
2) Critical pedagogy meetings: monthly meetings to share how social justice is explicitly applied in each course so that faculty could build on one another's classes to achieve vertical and horizontal integration of social justice in our curriculum;
3) Critical pedagogy consultation sessions: informal meetings where professors can seek and receive consultation, feedback, coaching, and support from their department peers on classroom issues regarding power and privilege, equity, microaggressions, etc. (Garran et al., 2014); and

4) Assessment sessions: dedicated time at year-end retreats to assess how we are progressing on implementing our social justice commitment as a department (including reflection on the results of the student experience survey).

These dedicated meetings served as opportunities for faculty to collaborate on the continuous process to develop, implement, analyze, reflect on, and revise the ways in which social justice is demonstrated in our syllabi, learning materials, application assignments, and teaching practices.

Such articulation of a shared conceptualization of social justice in the curriculum was essential, and "living" this conceptualization meant a process of constant evolution and mutual adaptation. The social work department grew from five full-time faculty to nine between 2016-2019. Given our equity principle, we did not want the ideas of original five faculty to impose on the new faculty. As new faculty members joined the department, they contributed new perspectives, and faculty discussed, debated, expanded upon, and revised the social justice statement until consensus was reached. Again, consistent with our equity principle, part-time faculty were not expected to take on extra workload such as participating in social justice meetings, and they typically did not attend them. To ensure that the implementation of the social justice-focused curriculum is consistent across the MSW and BSW courses, the program director of each program discussed the social justice principles and their applications in particular courses with adjunct faculty.

The MSW curriculum was developed before the program launched and admitted students. However, since the program was launched the department regularly sought feedback from students through student experience surveys on diversity and social justice in our explicit and implicit curricula, which were analyzed and used for improvement and future planning. See Table 1 in Appendix for samples of student surveys. The MSW program director also holds regular informal meetings ("Director's Tea") with MSW students to gain their perspective and direct feedback throughout the academic year. In addition, the department seeks feedback and consultation on its explicit and implicit curricula (including educational policies) from community members through quarterly meetings with the community advisory committee and the practicum advisory board whose membership includes representatives from current students, alumni, practicum instructors, and community organizations. The feedback and consultation from students and community members are applied to continuous improvement of the MSW curricula. Finally, the department's progress on social justice commitment (along with other educational outcomes) is reported yearly to the department's community advisory committee members who serve as our accountability partners.

Social Work Department Statement of Commitment to Social Justice in Our Curriculum (Seattle University Dept of Social Work, 2020)

The departmental statement of social justice commitment, adopted in September 2020, reflects our work since 2016; it explicates our conceptualization of social justice and illustrates how it is implemented in our curriculum and in our pedagogy. The statement, shared in its entirety here, is a collective work of the department faculty.

Our Commitment

The Social Work Department is committed to educating students for social justice-focused social work practice by integrating a social justice lens throughout our undergraduate and graduate programs. All courses in our curriculum, rather than one or two designated "diversity" courses, examine issues of social justice. The department seeks to prepare competent and effective practitioners who restore, maintain, and enhance human and community well-being with unwavering attention to social and economic justice. As we do so, we integrate four central facets of social justice: (i) an equity lens, (ii) anti-oppressive analysis and practice, (iii) critical pedagogy (including multiple critical theories), and (iv) decolonizing framework. In this document, we introduce our definitions of social justice and explain how we incorporate it into our department.

Why Social Justice?

The Social Work Department's commitment to Social Justice builds off the mission of Seattle University (SU). The university is committed to value-oriented education. SU is committed to teaching, learning, and growth of the whole person through a process of formation for leadership to improve the well-being of others and work toward "a just and humane world" (Seattle University Master of Social Work Program, n.d., Why Social Justice, para. 1). The department prepares its students with knowledge, values, and skills to analyze social inequity and oppression in its manifest forms, and to seek systemic change as effective advocates for social and economic justice. In addition, the Social Work Department's focus on social justice is in keeping with the values of the social work profession:

> The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person-in-environment framework, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, the purpose of social work is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons, locally and globally. (CSWE, Educational Policy, 2015, 2015, p. 5)

> Social workers pursue social change, particularly with and on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed individuals and groups of people. Social workers' social change efforts are focused primarily on issues of poverty, unemployment, discrimination, and other forms of social injustice. These activities seek to promote sensitivity to and knowledge about oppression and cultural and ethnic diversity. Social workers strive to ensure access to needed information, services, and resources; equality of opportunity; and meaningful participation in decision making for all people. (NASW, Code of Ethics, 2008, Preamble, para. 1)

> Social workers have a responsibility to promote social justice, in relation to society generally, and in relation to the people with whom they work. This means: Challenging negative discrimination… Recognizing diversity… [and] Distributing resources equitably. (IFSW, Statement of Ethical Principles, 2018, p. 4)

Justice is clearly an essential value of the social work profession and social work education; however, it can inadvertently become a hollow ideal unless it is specifically addressed in all applications of social work knowledge and skills. Consequently, the concept of justice anchors the curriculum, and is central to the department's mission.

Our Conception of Social Justice

Introductory Notes

Our BSW program prepares students for generalist practice while our MSW program has a clinical specialization. The following ideas and plans about social justice will be applied in ways that correspond with the focus of each program. In addition, these definitions and goals may change as we continue to grow and learn and as we respond to changes to the higher education landscape, and changes in scholarly, socio-political, cultural, and activist thinking. This document is ever evolving, and it reflects our current thinking about the current landscape.

As faculty, we are in process with this work. The following is an articulation of our goals and commitments. However, we are not there yet. Our curriculum will be revised on an ongoing basis, and our faculty constantly strives to learn more, so that we can achieve the goals stated on the following pages. Sometimes we succeed and sometimes we fail, but we continue trying. This is a lifetime of work, and we will not ever be done with it. We are always working to live up to the aspirational goals and values described in the following sections.

Finally, although this document focuses on our curriculum, we have also been incorporating a social justice analysis to the implicit (non-curricular) aspects of our program. This includes admission and enrollment, advising, course scheduling, hiring, mentoring, scholarships and allocation of resources, etc.

Our Four-Facet Framework

The Social Work Department is committed to integrating a social justice lens throughout our programs. We understand social justice as a concept involving multiple dimensions. As such, we integrate four central facets of social justice: 1) *an Equity Lens*, 2) *Anti-Oppressive Analysis and Practice,* 3) *Critical Pedagogy*, and 4) *Decolonizing Framework.*

Social Justice Facet 1: Equity Lens

In this department, the concept of justice is examined through the lens of equity, rather than equality. While equality guarantees equal rights and access under the law, it does not address the reality that some people need more than others,or have been denied equal access throughout history. On the other hand, equity is concerned with addressing need and restitution, rather than mere equality. Equity requires equality under the law but also

requires the remedying of material hardships. Equity involves economic, political, social, and human rights and opportunities.

Our department operates from the assumption that social justice is not measured merely by legal equality or by simply an equal distribution of social and economic goods. Yes, social justice includes legal equality and equal distribution of goods, but it also encompasses whether people are able to reach their full capacities, how decisions are made, which and whose perspectives are represented, and to what extent. Consequently, Seattle University's Social Work Department defines equity as consisting of four components: (A) distribution; (B) representation and recognition; (C) process and participation; and (D) capabilities. Students in our department can expect to be required to interrogate these four concepts:

Distribution

Throughout history, many influential thinkers considered the distribution of wealth, resources, and goods to be a key component of social justice (Reisch, 2002). Distributive justice is the idea that resources should be distributed equally, and social and economic systems must be arranged and redistributed so that they most benefit the least advantaged members of society. Consequently, systems of economic oppression or structural discrimination must be challenged in order to create social policies directed toward a more just distribution of social goods. Poverty and economic inequality are the result of structural economic oppression and the systematically unequal distributions of resources.

Equity that is focused on distribution is based upon the redistribution of goods and resources as determined by need, rather than by class, merit, or identity. One example of how we utilize this aspect of equity can be seen in how we distribute scholarships to our students. In our department, scholarships are based upon need, rather than on merit, because too often merit is measured by criteria that are more easily achieved by students with resources.

Representation and Recognition

Equity that is focused on issues of representation and recognition is concerned with how marginalized groups are treated in the public sphere (e.g., the media, literature, research, or the law), and whether/how they are granted access to certain social institutions (e.g., schools, marriage, public accommodations, voting, etc.). Representation and recognition require full equality under the law for all social identity groups, as well as their fair, accurate, and multi-dimensional representation in cultural and educational domains.

In the pursuit of social justice focused on representation and recognition, our department centralizes the concept of intersectionality. Originating from Black feminists such as Patricia Hill Collins (2002), the Combahee River Collective (1977), Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), bell hooks (1990), and Audre Lorde (1983), intersectionality requires the examination of any issue through the lens of multiple identity groups. Feminists of color have argued that there are multiple oppressions, along lines of social identity groups such as gender, race, and class (as well as ability, age, citizenship, ethnicity, religion, and

sexual orientation). Intersectionality posits, among other things, that it is impossible to understand any one experience of discrimination without understanding how it is impacted by all other systems of oppression and privilege (racism, capitalism, sexism, heterosexism, xenophobia, able-ism, etc.). An intersectional analysis recognizes that people have both advantages and disadvantages due to their locations in multiple systems of oppression. Thus, they can receive privilege from their position in one system (e.g., racism), but be disadvantaged because of their position in another overlapping system (e.g., homophobia). True justice requires liberation from all of these oppressions, none of which can be assigned a place of primacy over the others.

By virtue of their positions on society's "margins," certain groups have unique and important perspectives that must be centralized in social justice work. Centering the margins is the process of prioritizing the needs of those people who have been marginalized. Building off of the ideas of bell hooks (1990), many social justice activists engage in "trickle up social justice work," which operates from the assumption that social justice trickles up, but it does not trickle down (DeFilippis & Anderson-Nathe, 2017; Flanders, 2012). In other words, if policies are made with the intention of helping the most dominant members of society, the benefits rarely trickle down to also support the most marginalized. However, policies designed to help those at the margins usually trickle up and also provide benefits to those with more privilege. Centering the margins is the commitment to serving everyone by prioritizing the needs of those placed at the bottom of structural hierarchies.

One example of how we operationalize this aspect of equity is through our commitment to representational equity in our curriculum. At least 50% of the learning materials in all Social Work classes (and other classes designed by Social Work faculty) will reflect non-dominant perspectives, knowledge and authorship of people of color, and/or knowledge and authorship of other marginalized populations.

Process and Participation

We believe that equity cannot be measured only by outcomes, but also by the systems of process and participation that lead to the outcomes. Equity that is focused on process and participation draws from long-standing notions (going back at least to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1762/1993) that the people must come together to function and legislate as a collective, and that decision-making must be made by the people, not the elite. To do this, equity efforts must focus on increasing the ability of subordinated groups to access power and control in all areas of society. Social justice requires a society where all people have access to, and control of, various systems and institutions, such as voting, government, education, media, economics, social services, etc.

Examples of how we operationalize this aspect of equity can be seen in various courses taught at the undergraduate and graduate level. In the community practice course, learning activities are designed so that students work on community development or organizing issues in collaboration with community partners. Community partners determine the issue that they would like students to understand and collaborate on, develop collaborative learning/project work plans that are mutually useful to the community and the students'

learning, and help evaluate and/or reflect on the project. Such assignments provide pertinent opportunities for students to deepen their engagement with the community in the learning process. In the program evaluation course, students work on an impact evaluation for a selected agency using community-based research methodologies. In the policy courses, students get an opportunity to participate in advocacy and lobby events, such as the NASW Lobby Day.

Capabilities

We also believe that equity requires that all individuals be able to live up to their own capabilities. We draw on the ideas of Amartya Sen (1985, 2011), Martha Nussbaum (2003), and others who examine social justice through the lens of capabilities. Capabilities can be described as the opportunities that an individual has in order to achieve their fullest potential or do what they believe adds value to their own life. These capabilities are impacted by social, political, economic, and cultural structures that individuals are embedded in and interact with.

We believe this framework is connected to the social work value (described in the NASW Code of Ethics) of the dignity and worth of all people. Social workers promote clients' self-determination and seek to enhance clients' capacity to change and to address their own needs. Because of this, we believe that social justice requires the need for all individuals and communities to get equitable opportunities to reach their full potential.

With our department, we operationalize this aspect of equity in our pedagogical framework as well as the contents that we teach the students. For example, all professors utilize a diverse set of teaching tools and close mentorship so that students from all backgrounds and learning styles can be supported to achieve their fullest potential. In addition to this, our hallmark course on Social Justice ensures that students understand the inequities at micro, mezzo, and macro levels, and how it impacts an individual or community's ability to access opportunities to achieve well-being.

Our department defines equity in all four of these ways, and we believe that without a careful and critical investigation of the mechanisms and sources of inequity in distribution, representation and recognition, process and participation, and capabilities, inequities may go unnoticed. Or worse, inequities may be blamed on the marginalized.

As are result of the above, we are committed to teaching about social justice in ways that:

- look beyond the usual questions of diversity and equality, to examine the more complex issues of distribution, representation and recognition, process and participation, and capabilities;
- emphasize and explore equity (including all of the above dimensions of equity) in the classroom discussions, readings, assignments, and through field practice.

Social Justice Facet 2: Anti-oppressive Analysis and Practice.

We begin with an Anti-oppressive Analysis.

Our understanding of social justice includes a critical anti-oppressive analysis (Morgaine & Capous-Desyllas, 2014). An anti-oppressive curriculum examines the dynamics of power that produce economic oppression (poverty, homelessness, exploitation, and class disparities) as well as inequities, discrimination, and oppression based upon identity (race, gender, ability, immigration status, religion, sexuality, etc.). Our department is committed to respect for diversity, and to considering the impact of human diversity and intersectionality on human development and functioning. To prepare students for practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities, the department emphasizes a critical consideration of the impact of intersectionality on human development and functioning, and the social work practice setting. An anti-oppressive analysis emphasizes the consequences of structural injustice and socioeconomic oppression on the lives of vulnerable populations, and the importance of equity-based practice. Such an analysis must centralize the historical, economic, and structural contexts that produce oppression. See Tables 2-4 in Appendix for examples of assignments.

As a result of this analysis, we are committed to the following as we teach students how to engage in social work practice:

In the classroom and in the field, we educate students to bring an anti-oppressive analysis into their practice.

Anti-oppressive practice (AOP) requires the social work practitioner to critically examine the various power imbalances that are found in society, within organizational structures, and between the social worker and their clients. AOP requires that social workers strategize ways to diminish all three of those power imbalances, promoting equity and empowerment for their clients in all contexts. The department emphasizes the interconnection between individual struggles, structural inequalities, and historical oppression. We also emphasize how those struggles are connected to human diversity and intersectionality. All of these areas of study must be integrated in order to understand human development and functioning, and to engage in empowering practice.

A vital aspect of AOP is critical analysis of client and social worker relationship. Building on the concept of critical reflexivity (D'cruz et al., 2007; Fook, 2016; Lay & McGuire, 2010), social workers are compelled to locate themselves and their clients within the larger sociopolitical and historical dynamics of power in analyzing and understanding not only the client-worker interactions but also the interactions between the worker, the client, and the larger systems (including organizations and social and economic policies). From the basis of that critical analysis social workers are called to co-create, with clients, interventions that consider changes at all (micro, mezzo, macro) levels.

We train our students to think critically about both the strengths and limitations of their agency-based practice, and to be informed of the important critiques of the non-profit industrial complex that has been offered by a range of activists and scholars (INCITE: Women of Color Against Violence, 2007). These critiques contend that when social service

work is completely disconnected from large social change work it has the potential to calcify social problems. They also argue that many nonprofits are structured like for-profit corporations and may function in ways that do not promote social justice values. And yet, these critics also recognize that most social service workers and social service agencies are operating from the best of intentions and frequently do very important work, despite the reality of working within the significant legal, funding, and structural limitations of 501(c)3s. Consequently, our faculty help students to wrestle with these tensions, and to identify ways that agency-based work can be conducted in alignment with the social justice principles we have identified throughout this document.

In the classroom and in the field, we educate students to make the connections between the problems facing an individual and the structural issues that may be contributing to those problems.

Furthermore, such analysis of power is required at all levels of interaction—micro, mezzo, and macro—including in client-social worker interactions. It also encourages seeking interventions that integrate micro, mezzo, and macro level changes, including activism. Our goal is to train our students to develop strategies for creating a just society, free from oppression, racism, exploitation, and other forms of discrimination in the larger society by engaging at the community, legal and political levels, while also delivering services with individuals and families in an inclusive manner.

In the classroom and in the field, we educate students to make advocacy a central part of their practice.

Promotion of human and social well-being involves all levels of practice, including advocacy for human rights, social justice, and economic justice. The department explicitly aims to educate students to understand manifestations and mechanisms of oppression. These forms of oppression may include the larger policies, norms, or laws that can impact the ability of social work agencies to provide effective services, as well as those manifestations of injustice that can occur within direct social work practice. Students are thus prepared to understand the impact of the organizational realities in which they practice as it affects clients and community members, as well as social workers, and their relationships with each other. With this understanding, students can collaborate with clients or community members as partners with whom to advocate for policies and practices that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

In the classroom and in the field, we educate students about evidence-based practice.

In the classroom and in the field, we introduce students to a wide range of thought, modalities, interventions, programs, adaptations, and ideas that are thought to enhance well-being. We train students in the knowledge and skills related to evidence-based practice but also acknowledge the limitations and need for further model and intervention development to meet the unique needs of communities, particularly marginalized and diverse communities. We understand that the evidence for these practices is not applicable for all individuals, families and communities. We consider how many interventions, services, and programs are not accessible, even to those they were designed to serve. We recognize that some communities are underserved or unserved, and therefore requirements

of evidence-based practice can stifle or prohibit the ingenuity and creativity needed to develop programs for them. Therefore, we teach students to think about ways that interventions can be adapted and developed. We also teach students to consider other research-informed interventions and promising practices.

We teach students about clinical skills from a place of curiosity and compassion—understanding that just as individuals, families, and communities have unique reactions to systems of oppression, students also may have unique reactions to learning the material. We believe that students should be equipped with a wide range of therapeutic tools in order to provide choice in their practice. What may provide regulation, connection, and calm for one, may be triggering and dysregulating for another. The on-going impact of systems of oppression cannot be ignored in every aspect of clinical work and therefore a trauma sensitive approach is woven through courses. We work to destigmatize social work and mental health by both understanding the complex systems within we are living and our natural reactions to those systems. We consider how harm happens in each system in unique ways for different people. We, along with students, challenge ourselves to find many different ways to connect.

Because critical self-reflection is an integral component of anti-oppressive practice, students have opportunities to self-reflect on not only the material presented, but on how the material sits with students and how reactions are often connected with the lens of their experience. Our goal is for this self-reflection to be done with compassion and patience and to be on-going throughout the program in a supportive environment and a life-long practice. We understand that ultimately this helps us to show up authentically in our work.

Social Justice Facet 3: Critical Pedagogy

Our Philosophy of Teaching Centers Social Justice-focused Content and Process

The department's commitment to social justice is carried into teaching and learning; as such, educational content and process must be congruent with each other. Deeply influenced by Freire's (1970/2018) critical pedagogy, the department strives to foster an equitable environment where students and instructors co-construct critical knowledge. We believe that students' own lived experiences and life knowledge can help inform class discussions and practice. Deconstructing where ideas or facts come from helps students uncover unstated assumptions, biases, or values, and examine the role of power in the creation of knowledge.

We Consider Critical Thinking an Essential Skill for Social Work Practice

An important aspect of critical pedagogy is critical thinking. In this philosophy of teaching, critical thinking incorporates critical analysis that questions normative discourses and excavates dynamics of power that undergird such discourses. Social work knowledge is necessarily complex and equivocal because the lives that social workers are entrusted to work with are complex and heterogeneous. Furthermore, social workers can unintentionally participate in maintaining repressive normative discourses if they lack

critical analysis. This critical perspective of knowledge, which is practiced and reinforced through class content and process, helps students understand that critical analysis is an essential tool and process for social justice practice. Instructors actively promote the development of multiple perspectives in students' analyses through class discussions, instructor feedback, and peer feedback. Equipped with critical thinking, critical reflection, and respect for diverse paradigms of knowledge, students are prepared to engage in research-informed practice with unwavering attention to social and economic justice.

We Believe that Students Should Be Exposed to a Range of Theories that Foster Critical Thinking

We believe that there is no one all-purpose theoretical approach to our practice. Understanding the strengths and limitations of multiple theories will give students a range of perspectives and options from which to draw in their academic work and in their practice. Therefore, we are committed to doing the following in our classrooms:

- The department fosters critical and complex thinking in students through its education, and this principle is infused and explicitly present throughout the curriculum. In order to foster critical thinking skills, instructors encourage students to question what may be taken for granted/normalized and what may be silenced or "othered" in all aspects of learning, including textbooks, articles, and lectures. To prepare students for practice in today's diverse world, the department underscores the importance of multiple perspectives in understanding diverse realities.
- We help students deconstruct dominant ideologies and behaviors.
- Faculty invite students to take ownership of their learning rather than assume a traditional role of a passive receiver of education.
- Faculty and students are encouraged to bring themselves into the course content, putting their lived experiences in the contexts of the class material, and learning from each other's practice and lives. Instructors often urge students to be accountable to the collective's overall learning by actively participating in all aspects of the learning process. Facilitating this active adult learning stance may include opportunities for students to take active leadership in class, such as a class discussion leadership assignment where students assign themselves to lead a brief class discussion.
- Students are encouraged to extend their critical thinking skills to reflect on the ways in which their assumptions, social locations, and actions influence a situation and how this reflective process in turn changes their thinking and practice.
- We are also committed to helping students explore how marginalized communities define justice for themselves. For example, the concept of "restorative justice" comes out of the work of various subordinated groups, including American indigenous populations (Zehr, 1990). It is a framework that

approaches justice by focusing on the needs of the victims, the offenders, and their communities. It is more focused on healing than on punishment. Victims take an active role in the process, while offenders are encouraged to repair the harm they have done. Restorative justice is just one example of the different conceptions of social justice to which our department is committed to exposing students.

- Critical thinking and analysis guide the department's approach to learning social work theories. The department employs a multi-theoretical model and emphasizes robust and critical understanding of contemporary social and psychological theories that inform social work knowledge and practice.
- The department is grounded in the person-in-environment framework. This framework informs the department's use of ecological and systems perspectives to conceptualize social work practice, which locate the focus of work within the person-in-environment interaction. Together these perspectives influence and inform the elements of practice by situating difficulties and interventions within and between the systems at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. This holistic view of the client or community member allows for comprehensive assessments that interrogate interactions and mutual influences between the person and the environment. In doing so, students learn how larger issues of economic or social injustice can impact the immediate well-being of clients and community members.
- We encourage students to consider theories that look critically at how society is constructed, as well as how knowledge is produced and disseminated. For instance, critical race theory puts race at the center of critical analysis by focusing on how endemic and pervasive racism is in society and its institutions and emphasizes multiple and varied voices of people of color (Williams, 1991). Similarly, feminist theories, Marxist theories, queer theory, postcolonial theory, and other critical theories also focus on structural analyses of society, while elevating the voices and lived experiences of various marginalized groups. Our classes may combine these critical theories with more dominant social work theoretical frameworks to help students develop complex and nuanced theoretical understandings of their work from multiple perspectives.
- Theories are not assumed to be authoritative or unequivocal but understood as always evolving and enriched by diverse perspectives of participants. Thus, the department encourages students to engage in deep interrogation of knowledge paradigms and contextual examination of relevant theories. The emphasis is not on finding the "right" theory that works for every case but rather on critical understanding of theoretical tenets and their applications, moderated by contextual appraisal for just practice. Course contents and assignments are designed to foster this learning process.

Social Justice Facet 4: A Decolonizing Framework

Preface

We acknowledge that there is no one, unified conceptualization of decolonization in scholarly literature. In fact, decolonization is a controversial issue. Indigenous scholars such as Tuck and Yang (2012) warn against turning decolonization into a metaphor and contend that decolonization must "bring about the repatriation of Indigenous land and life" (p. 1), and that the project of decolonization is distinct from the project of social justice. We also heed the distinction between colonialism and settler colonialism as argued by scholars of settler colonialism such Veracini (2011) and Steinman (2016).

We interrogate the continuing impact and practice of global colonialism and settler colonialism and our practice as social work educators and practitioners. In this endeavor we use the lens of coloniality (Quijano & Ennis, 2000) to understand global colonialism: the historical and continued modernist production of Eurocentric global hegemony that includes European conquest and occupation; racialization (Omi & Winant, 2012) and formation of "racial" hierarchy of the world population; re-identification of geocultural regions from the European dominance perspective; production of global capitalism through subjugated labor, resources, and products; and establishment of Eurocentric dominance of production of knowledge and culture. Veracini (2011) and Steinman (2016) distinguish settler colonialism from colonialism in that the project of settler colonialism is displacement and elimination of the Indigenous people and world (as compared to domination and extraction of labor and resources of the colonial project). Thus, Steinman argues, that decolonization and settler decolonization are different projects.

In this context, we are aware that the decolonizing framework that we are engaging here is in the sense of global colonialism. This view also at least partially reflects the make-up of our faculty; more than half of us are from nations that are historically, formally, and/or culturally and economically colonized. But more than that, we are thoroughly aware that coloniality is deeply implicated in the system of education, including social work education, within which we were educated and also currently located. In our efforts to avoid reducing decolonizing into a metaphor, we follow the guidance provided by Gray et al. (2016):

> Decolonizing social work requires that the [social work] profession acknowledge its complicity and ceases participation in colonial projects, openly condemns the past and continuing effects of colonialism; collaborates with Indigenous Peoples in engaging in decolonizing activities against public and private colonizing projects, and seeks to remove often subtle vestiges of colonization from theory and practice. (p. 7)

Background

We know that universities are often sites of the colonial project

Edward Said (1978) described how western nations have dealt with the peoples they have colonized: by not merely settling and ruling over them, but also by authorizing views of those people that define how they are understood. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1999) argued that colonized people are forced to engage in discourse, knowledge, laws, and norms that have been developed by the colonizers. Western countries perpetuate these views through their educational systems, where western thought becomes the standard – assumed to be universally relevant, valid, and applicable to all. Often what we understand as scientific and rational/objective knowledge actually serves the hidden agenda of assuming European superiority and non-European inferiority. Universities often center the experiences of white, western people, making them the invisible norm against which all other races and groups are compared. By perpetuating the idea that Whiteness is normal, all other people are implicitly (or explicitly) understood to be different, exotic, dangerous, and/or inferior. There is a "direct and material relation between the political processes and social structures of colonialism on the one hand, and western regimes of knowledge and representation on the other . . . Western epistemology and systems of knowledge have been integral to the internal colonial domination suffered by indigenous and nonwhite peoples" (Tejeda et al., 2003, p. 24). For Seattle University, the act of colonization is not merely metaphorical; it is also quite literal. We are on occupied Coast Salish land, and Seattle University is on the homelands of the Duwamish people. And we continue to benefit from this settler colonialism and occupation.

We know that social work is also often a site of the colonial project.

We recognize that the social work profession has often contributed to colonizing and oppression. The profession began, in part, by sending "friendly visitors" to try to change the alleged moral failings of the poor, and by creating settlement houses where immigrants were taught dominant norms and behaviors (Addams, 1899; Katz, 1996; Lasch-Quinn, 1993; Park & Kemp, 2006). The profession also has a history of working with the government to monitor, target, regulate, and discipline communities of color. This has occurred in such areas as the welfare system, child protection services, and the criminal justice system, among others (Schiele, 2010). Because of social work's partnership with the state, we recognize that, in the words of Freire and Moch (1990), "the social worker, as much as the educator, is not a neutral agent, either in practice or in action" (p. 5). In addition, we recognize that social work has often served to uphold economic inequality in the United States. Piven and Cloward (1971/2012) have documented how social welfare policy functions to support capitalism, rather than supporting poor people. Kivel (2006) has argued that social service programs can institutionalize and professionalize serving and controlling the poor instead of working to eradicate poverty. And Reisch (2013) has written about the ways in which neoliberal economic policies have shaped and limited social work practice. These and other scholars contend that social workers often blame the victims of economic exploitation and inequality for their own poverty, and focus on "fixing" poor

people, instead of working to challenge the systems that cause the exploitation and inequality.

Social work education can perpetuate oppression as well. Students are often taught cross-cultural competency that assumes static and generalized conceptions of the cultures being studied. Cross-cultural competency frameworks rarely position white experiences as a cultural phenomenon under study, which results in whiteness remaining invisible or the "norm" while simultaneously othering different racial groups. Cross cultural competency also puts social work students of color in the untenable position of assuming the social worker is a white American, and thus situates their own communities as "other" and in need of help from white people. This approach only propagates marginalization and internalized racism for students of color, and upholds the worldviews, knowledge bases, and experiences of dominant white society.

Finally, SU's Social Work faculty recognize our own culpability. We know that we have been trained in the same oppressive paradigms as the dominant culture, and have internalized many problematic ideas. Consequently, we are committed to thinking critically about our own practices and pedagogies. We must also be open to feedback from each other and from students, in order to continue the ongoing work of liberating our teaching.

We know that social work also effectively responds to oppression and enacts change.

Despite the oppressive history described above, the social work profession also contributes to liberatory work, when done thoughtfully and with a focus on social justice. Some forms of social work (anti-oppressive practice, strength-based practice, radical social work, critical social work, anti-colonial practice, indigenous social work practice, trauma-informed practice, etc.) focus on working with clients and community members in ways that prioritize their autonomy and dignity, and in pursuit of social and economic justice (Morgaine & Capous-Desyllas, 2014; Mullaly & Molgat, 2002; Reynolds, 1942). Through clinical practice, social workers respond to the complexities of people's lived experiences by practicing from equity and anti-oppressive lenses. Throughout our country's history, at times social workers have been actively involved in various social justice movements (anti-war, civil rights, immigrant rights, economic justice, welfare rights, education reform, etc.) and built coalitions with numerous social justice activists and organizations (Reisch & Andrews, 2014). The profession of social work has made important contributions to social justice.

Our Commitment to Decolonizing Our Curriculum.

As a result of all of the above, we are committed to decolonizing our curriculum.

- The faculty recognizes from our collective teaching experiences that the lack of representation of non-dominant perspectives as the source of knowledge has been a perennial problem. Not only is this shortfall problematic in terms of equity in representation but also it seriously limits students' ability to learn and use multiple and critical perspectives.

- Decolonizing knowledge in academia requires challenging oppressive knowledge, pedagogies, and methodologies. Social justice requires a relationship between the dominant and the subordinate that allows voices to be heard from the ground up. The dominant must be willing to unlearn domination and embrace their duty to others.
- We are committed to training our students to become leaders in dismantling unjust and unequal colonial legacies of power. In order to liberate the classroom, we require faculty and students to reflect on our dominant values and beliefs and to consider alternate ways of knowing, while examining how certain groups of voices, ideas, values, and peoples are marginalized, while others are privileged.
- We are committed to training social worker students to attack the systemic roots of poverty and economic inequality, rather than blaming the victims of those systems. This requires educating students about the role that neoliberal economic policies play in the lives of their clients and community members, as well in the design and delivery of social work programs and services.
- We are committed to beginning to liberate our profession by looking at social work practice, theory, research, programs, and policy through a critical, decolonized lens.
- We are committed to utilizing culturally relevant forms of scholarship and education that resist frameworks and paradigms that serve to universalize.
- Finally, for all of the above reasons, the Social Work Department has made an explicit commitment to representational equity in our curriculum. At least 50% of the learning materials (defined as required and suggested readings, videos, guest speakers, and exercises) in all Social Work classes will reflect:
    - non-dominant perspectives
    - knowledge and authorship of people of color
    - knowledge and authorship of other marginalized populations.

Lessons Learned and Implications for Social Work Education

Presented below are the lessons we learned from our department's work to create and implement a social justice-focused clinical program and their implications for social work education:

1) It is imperative to have a collective commitment to a mission. Re-envisioning a curriculum is rarely a smooth process and takes significant time and energy; our process was no exception. However, while the process of re-envisioning clinical social work from a social justice perspective was complicated, sometimes challenging, and demanding (especially since faculty's workload is already full), the collective commitment to our mission brought us together and inspired us to re-dedicate our time and energy to this necessary work.
2) Developing and implementing a social justice-focused clinical social work curriculum is a continuous and iterative process. There is no "end point" as we are all work in progress. Faculty regularly examine our effectiveness and

limitations in integrating social justice and collaborate on continuous assessment, revision, implementation, and reflection. Through this process, faculty practice critical analysis and pedagogy, demonstrating consistency in our philosophy and practice.

3) Social justice must be addressed and its applications must be articulated in each course (rather than only in a stand-alone course on justice or in policy courses). Vertical and horizontal integration of social justice concepts and applications throughout the curriculum enhances students' comprehension of social justice as an integral part of clinical social work. Furthermore, social justice must be addressed in each stage of clinical practice (engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation), and multi-level (micro/mezzo/macro) analysis and intervention should be required. Assignments can be designed so that students are challenged to make explicit connections between social justice concepts and practice (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2019). See Tables 2-4 in Appendix for sample assignments.

4) Social justice commitment should be consistently present in both explicit and implicit curricula and in departmental policy and processes. While the department's primary focus was on the explicit curriculum, it guided our implicit curriculum as well as how we operated as a department. For example, the department took leadership in social justice issues within the College of Arts and Sciences, such as offering social justice teach-in sessions, writing open letters about institutional racism, sponsoring campus-wide events to promote social justice, and supporting student activism. Consistent with equity principles, the department elected to allow all full-time faculty (tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure/clinical track) and staff equal voting rights on all departmental decisions except those prohibited by the university's policies, such as tenure and promotion decisions. Allocating resources, such as student scholarships, is guided by the equity principles. The department's social justice focus also impacted student recruitment as well as faculty and staff hiring since we were unambiguous about our social justice commitment in our communications with prospective candidates.

5) Evaluating our progress has been more difficult than we thought. We had instituted Social Justice and Diversity Survey for every course in the program to gain student feedback, but the response rate fell low after a few quarters even with incentives like a drawing for gift cards. Students complained that they felt over-surveyed since this survey was in addition to the regular, university-based course evaluation survey and the MSW program year-end survey. The program put the Social Justice and Diversity Survey on hold at this time and is researching a better way to gain student feedback for every course. In the meanwhile, the program is relying more on other avenues of feedback (e.g., Director's Tea, Community Advisory Committee, and Practicum Advisory Board).

6) Evaluating the impact of re-envisioning a clinical curriculum on clinical practice in a systematic manner is challenging. We have received anecdotal information from practicum instructors and alums about how our curriculum is influencing their practice in the field. However, our current alumni survey does not capture this information sufficiently. In addition, since the program has been in existence for only five years the long-term impact is yet to be seen. The program is currently researching a better way to gain this perspective.

7) Institutional context is important. As discussed in the Social Justice Statement section, the department's effort is consistent with the institution's social justice mission and goals. The university supports the department's work on social justice because it helps the institution achieve its overall goals. Lack of congruence between the department and the institution may pose additional challenges.

In this paper, I shared the process of building and living a social justice-focused clinical program, the departmental statement of social justice commitment, and implications for social work education. As indicated, the work is continuous and will evolve as we continue to grow and learn and respond to changes to the higher education landscape as well as in scholarly, socio-political, cultural, and activist thinking. Clinical social work has made many contributions to countless lives as well as to the social work profession. Re-envisioning clinical social work education to center social justice strengthens its contributions.

References

Addams, J. (1899). A function of the social settlement. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *13*(3), 33-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271629901300302

Apgar, D. (2020). Increasing social work students' participation in macro specialization: the impossible dream? *Advances in Social Work, 20*(3), 709-724. https://doi.org/10.18060/24045

Asakura, K., Strumm, B., Todd, S., & Varghese, R. (2020). What does social justice look like when sitting with clients? A qualitative study of teaching clinical social work from a social justice perspective. *Journal of Social Work Education, 56*(3), 442-455. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1656588

Atteberry-Ash, B., Nicotera, N., & Gonzales, B. (2019). Walk the talk of power, privilege, and oppression: A template analysis. *Journal of Social Work Education, 57*(1), 7-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1661917

Bowles, D. D., & Hopps, J. G. (2014). The profession's role in meeting its historical mission to serve vulnerable populations. *Advances in Social Work, 15*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.18060/16677

Collins, P. H. (2002). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.

Combahee River Collective. (1977). *A Black feminist statement.* https://we.riseup.net/assets/43875/combahee%2520river.pdf

Corley, N., & Young, S. (2018). Is social work still racist? A content analysis of recent literature. *Social Work, 63*(4), 317-326. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swy042

Council on Social Work Education. (2015). *Educational policy.* https://cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS_Web_FINAL.pdf.aspx

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=uclf

D'cruz, H., Gillingham, P., & Melendez, S. (2007). Reflexivity, its meanings and relevance for social work: A critical review of the literature. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *37*(1), 73-90. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl001

DeFilippis, J. N., & Anderson-Nathe, B. (2017). Embodying margin to center: Intersectional activism among queer liberation organizations. In M. Brettschneider, S. Burgess, & C. Keating (Eds.), *LGBTQ politics: A critical reader. A new collection of essays* (pp. 110-132). NYU Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt8jh.11

Epple, D. M. (2007). Inter and intra professional social work differences: Social works challenge. *Clinical Social Work, 35*, 267-276. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-007-0098-0

Flanders, L. (2012). Dean Spade [Video]. *The Nation.* https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/dangerous-rush-legislate-surveillance-and-mental-health-dean-spade-video/

Fook, J. (2016). *Social work: A critical approach to practice* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA (Original work 1970).

Freire, P., & Moch, M. (1990). A critical understanding of social work. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, *1*(1), 3-9. https://doi.org/10.1300/J059v01n01_02

Garran, A. M., Kang, H. K., & Fraser, E. (2014). Pedagogy and diversity: Enrichment and support for social work instructors engaged in social justice education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 34*(5), 564-574. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2014.952868

Garran, A., Werkmeister-Rozas, L., Kang, H.-K. & Miller, J. (2022). *Racism in the United States: Implications for the Helping Profession* (3rd ed.). Springer.

Gray, M., Coates, J., Yellow Bird, M., & Hetherington, T. (2016). Decolonizing social work. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315576206

Harrison, J., VanDeusen, K., & Way, I. (2016). Embedding social justice within micro social work curricula. *Smith Studies in Social Work, 86*(3), 258-273. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2016.1191802

hooks, b. (1990). choosing the margin as a space of radical openness. In *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics* (pp. 145-153). South End Press.

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence (Eds.). (2007). *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the nonprofit industrial complex*. South End Press.

International Federation of Social Workers. (2018). *Global social work statement of ethical principles.* https://www.iassw-aiets.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Global-Social-Work-Statement-of-Ethical-Principles-IASSW-27-April-2018-1.pdf

Kang, H.-K. (2013). Claiming immigrant cultural citizenship: Applying postcolonial theories to social work practice with immigrants. *Critical and Radical Social Work, 1*(2), 233-245. https://doi.org/10.1332/204986013X673290

Katz, M. B. (1996). *In the shadow of the poorhouse: A social history of welfare in America*. Basic Books.

Kivel, P. (2006). Social service or social change? In Incite! (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the nonprofit industrial complex* (pp. 129-150) Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11smnz6.15

Lasch-Quinn, E. (1993). Chapter 2: A social church but not a mission. In *Black neighbors: Race and the limits of reform in the American settlement house movement, 1890-1945* (pp. 47-74). Haworth Press.

Lay, K., & McGuire, L. (2010). Building a lens for critical reflection and reflexivity in social work education. *Social Work Education*, *29*(5), 539-550. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470903159125

Lorde, A. (1983). There is no hierarchy of oppressions. *Bulletin: Homophobia and education*, *14*(3/4), 9. http://www.pages.drexel.edu/~jc3962/COR/Hierarchy.pdf

McLaughlin, A. M. (2009). Clinical social workers: Advocates for social justice. *Advances in Social Work, 10*(1), 51-68. https://doi.org/10.18060/209

McLaughlin, A. M. (2011). Exploring social justice for clinical social work practice. *Smith Studies in Social Work, 81*(2-3), 234-251. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2011.588551

Mehrotra, G. R., Hudson, K. D., & Self, J. M. (2017): What are we teaching in diversity and social justice courses? A qualitative content analysis of MSW syllabi. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *37*(3), 218-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2017.1316342

Morgaine, K., & Capous-Desyllas, M. (2014). *Anti-Oppressive Social Work Practice*. Sage.

Mullaly, R. P., & Molgat, C. (2002). *Challenging oppression: A critical social work approach*. Oxford University Press.

National Association of Social Workers. (2021). *Code of ethics.* https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics-English

Nussbaum, M. C. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Feminist Economics, 9*(2-3), 33-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570022000077926

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2012). Racial formation in the United States. In W. Longhofer & D. Winchester (Eds.), *Social theory re-wired: New connections to classical and contemporary perspectives* (Interactive book, pp. 348-363). Routledge.

Park, Y., & Kemp, S. P. (2006). 'Little alien colonies': Representations of immigrants and their neighborhoods in social work discourse, 1875–1924, *Social Service Review, 80*(4), 705-734. https://doi.org/10.1086/507934

Parker, L. (2003). A social justice model for clinical social work practice. *Affilia*, *18*(3), 272-288. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109903254586

Piven, F. F., & Cloward, R. (2012). *Regulating the poor: The functions of public welfare*. Vintage. (Original work published 1971)

Quijano, A., & Ennis, M. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South* ,*1*(3), 533-580. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005

Reisch, M. (2002). Defining social justice in a socially unjust world. *Families in Society*, *83*(4), 343-354. https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.17

Reisch, M. (2013). Social work education and the neo-liberal challenge: The US response to increasing global inequality. *Social Work Education*, *32*(6), 715-733. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2013.809200

Reisch, M., & Andrews, J. (2014). *The road not taken: A history of radical social work in the United States*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315800646

Reynolds, B. C. (1942). *Learning and teaching in the practice of social work.* Rinehart.

Rousseau, J. J. (1993). *The* social contract and discourses. Orion Publishing Group, Ltd. (Original work published 1762)

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western representations of the Orient.* Pantheon.

Seattle University Dept of Social Work. (2020). Social justice statement. https://www.seattleu.edu/media/college-of-arts-and-sciences/graduate-degrees/master-of-social-work/documents/Seattle-U-Social-Work-Department-Social-Justice-Statement-2020.pdf

Seattle University Master of Social Work Program. (n.d.). Mission. https://www.seattleu.edu/artsci/msw/about/#d.en.1856856

Schiele, J. H. (2010). *Social welfare policy: Regulation and resistance among people of color*. Sage Publications.

Schiele, J. H., & Hopps, J. G. (2009). Racial minorities then and now: The continuing significance of race [Guest editorial]. *Social Work, 54*, 195-199. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/54.3.195

Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities* (1st ed.). Elsevier Science.

Sen, A. (2011). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1999). *Can the subaltern speak?* Harvard University Press.

Steinman, E. W. (2016). Decolonization not inclusion: Indigenous resistance to American settler colonialism. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 2*(2), 219-236. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649215615889

Swenson, C. R. (1998). Clinical social work's contribution to a social justice perspective. *Social Work, 43*(6), 527-537. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/43.6.527

Tejeda, C., Espinoza, M., & Gutierrez, K. (2003). Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered. In P. Trifoas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 9-38). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203465547

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*, *1*(1), 1-40. https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf

Varghese, R., & Kang, H.-K. (2019). Essential knowledge for clinical social work practice: social work faculty perspectives. *Smith Studies in Social Work, 89*(3-4), 200-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2019.1702344

Veracini, L. (2011). Introducing: settler colonial studies. *settler colonial studies, 1*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2011.10648799

Williams, P. J. (1991). *The alchemy of race and rights*. Harvard University Press.

Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Herald Press.

Author note: Hye-Kyung Kang, Seattle University, Department of Social Work. Email: kangh@seattleu.edu

Appendix A

Table 1. *Sample Student Surveys: Social Justice & Diversity Survey & Year-End Survey*

Social Justice & Diversity Survey*

The SU Master of Social Work program strives to practice social justice & embody diversity in every aspect of the program from the way we administer to how we teach. This survey will help us to identify the extent to which both are practiced in the classroom. Please answer all of the Likert scale questions & use the comment box to supplement your responses.

1= None at all, 2= A little, 3= A moderate amount, 4= A lot, 5= A great deal

Q1. To what extent did the course content (reading materials, activities, assignments etc.) in the SEMINAR portion of SOCW 5010 "Foundation Field Practicum," promote social justice?
Q2. To what extent did the course content (reading materials, activities, assignments etc.) in the SEMINAR portion of SOCW 5010 "Foundation Field Practicum," promote diversity?
Q3. How effective was your instructor in the SEMINAR portion of SOCW 5010 "Foundation Field Practicum," in addressing social justice in his/her/their instruction (teaching methods, facilitation, etc.)?
Q4. How effective was your instructor in the SEMINAR portion of SOCW 5010 "Foundation Field Practicum," in promoting diversity in his/her/their instruction (teaching methods, facilitation, etc.)?
Q5. Please share additional comments regarding social justice & diversity in the SEMINAR portion of SOCW 5010.

*The same survey was conducted on every MSW course.

Year-End Survey [Diversity Section]**

Please rate the following statements from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree".

1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly disagree

Q1. Social work classes encourage discussions about diversity & difference.
Q2. I feel free to raise issues about diversity that are important to me in my social work classes.
Q3. The Social Work Program demonstrates a commitment to diversity in its:
  a. Curriculum
  b. Selection of field sites & clientele
  c. Faculty
  d. Student Cohort
Q4. I am treated with respect in the Social Work program:
  a. By faculty
  b. By administration & staff
  c. By my fellow classmates
Q5. Please share additional comments about diversity in the program.

** This survey is part of a larger Year-End Survey. Only the section on diversity is shown here as an example.

Table 2. *Sample Assignments Overview*

Assignment 1: **Engagement & Assessment (Part 1 of the Case Study Assignment)**

Course: SOCW 5610 Advanced Practice I: Clinical Social Work with Individuals

CASE STUDY ASSIGNMENT

This three-part paper assignment is designed to help you build a complete case study. While this assignment is divided into three parts, they collectively form an integrated case study. Therefore, you must use the same case for all three assignments. The assignment takes you through the process of change: engagement, assessment, intervention, & evaluation. In this assignment, you are strongly encouraged to integrate knowledge & skills from generalist curriculum courses (e.g., Human Behavior in the Social Environment, Human Development, Social Justice, Policy, & Research) as well as courses that are concurrently taken in this quarter (Mental Health Diagnosis & Specialized Practice Practicum).

This assignment supports integration between course content & field learning. It also enhances horizontal & vertical integration of learning as students are expected to build on the generalist practice curriculum knowledge & skills as well as the Mental Health Diagnosis course (which is concurrently taken) content. Read the following instructions carefully & address all items on the list in your paper.

ALL identifying information must be removed and/or disguised. Use pseudonyms for individual names, agency names, etc. Graduate-level writing is required for this assignment & will be considered in grading. I urge you to consult with the Writing Center in advance to get editing support *before* you submit your paper.

Paper 1: Engagement, Assessment, & Case Formulation
Paper 2: Research & Theory Informed Intervention
Paper 3: Evaluation, Ethical Consideration, & Self-Reflection

Table 3a. *Paper 1: Engagement*

Section	Objective(s)
A. Description of Client	• Who is the client? Document *brief* identifying information including name (a pseudonym), age, gender identification, racial identification, & ethnic identification.
B. Referral	• Who referred the client? Self-referral? Voluntary? Involuntary? • When was the referral made? What was the referral process?
C. Engagement Process & Use of Self	• What is the context of client engagement? (e.g., Community-based mental health agency setting? School setting? Medical setting? Etc.) • When was the context of your initial contact with the client? (At intake? After intake & then assigned to you? Transferred from another worker to you?) • What is your role with the client? How was the relationship negotiated with and/or explained to the client? • What are your strengths in terms of working with this client? • What are your initial fears & assumptions, especially in regard to intersectional identities/positionalities? • What are some possible transference/counter-transference issues? • What power dynamics have you anticipated/observed/experienced? • Reflect on the engagement process. What have you learned about your use of self in this process? What are some contextual issues you might have missed in the early phase of engagement? How would you use this insight in the continuous engagement with the client?

Table 3b. *Paper 1: Assessment*

Section	Objective(s)
D. Presenting Concerns/ Issues & History	a. What are the presenting issues from the client's perspective? b. What are the presenting issues from others' perspectives (family, friends, referral source, etc.)? c. What is the history of the issue(s)? ▪ When did it begin? Is there an identifiable incident? ▪ How has the client been coping with it? What has been helpful? What exacerbates the issue? d. Has the client experienced similar issue(s) before? What happened? e. Has the client had similar issues before? What were the results? f. What would the client most want help with?
E. Contextual Intersectional analysis (Bio-psychosocial-spiritual assessment)	a. What is the client's age? In which activities & responsibilities does the client engage in accordance with his/her/their life stage (e.g., school, job, etc.)? What are the resources & barriers related to the client's life stage? b. How does the client identify in terms of race & ethnicity? What is their impact on his/her/their life? (e.g., How does the client experience structural & institutional privilege or marginalization due to his/her/their identities? What is the client's relationship with his/her/their racial & ethnic identities? How does the larger community support or marginalize the client's identities?) c. How does the client identify in terms of gender? How does the gender identification impact the client's life? (e.g., How does the client experience structural & institutional privilege or marginalization due to gender identification? What is the client's relationship with his/her/their gender identity? How does the larger community support or marginalize the client's gender identity?) d. How does the client identify in terms of sexual orientation? How does the sexual orientation impact the client's life? (e.g., How does the client experience structural & institutional privilege or marginalization due to sexual orientation? What is the client's relationship with his/her/their sexual orientation identification? How does the larger community support or marginalize the client's sexual orientation?) e. What is the client's socio-economic status, & how does it influence his/her/their life? (What are the client's income sources? Are the client's basic needs met? What impact does the socio-economic status have on the client's ability to access material or social capital resources? How does the client experience structural & institutional privilege or marginalization due to socio-economic status?) f. How is the client's physical health & how does it influence his/her/their life? Are there any health/medical problems (including substance abuse)? Does the client have access to culturally appropriate medical & dental care (including routine care, chronic or short-term illness care, emergency care, rehabilitation care, & long-term care)? g. If the client has disability issues, how is the disability understood in the client's community contexts? How adapted/accessible are home, neighborhood, workplace, school, etc.? What are the client's specific needs, challenges, or strengths related to disabilit(ies)? h. What does spirituality mean in the client's life? Does the client follow a religious or spiritual tradition? Does the client have other connection to spirituality (such as a moral or philosophical values/beliefs)? How do the client's spirituality and/or religion shape the meaning of the client's life? i. What is the client's immigration and/or citizenship status & history? How does the client's (or client's family's) immigration status or history influence the client's life (including structural & institutional privilege or marginalization)?

Section	Objective(s)
	j. What is the clients' family context? Who does the client identify as his/her/their family (family of origin, chose family, etc.)? What is the relationship dynamic between family members? Use a family genogram to illustrate. k. What is the client's community context (e.g., how does the client identify & feel about his/her/their communities)? Who are the client's support system, important friendships or relationships, & what are their impact on the client's life? Use an ecomap to illustrate. How does the larger community support or marginalize the client's communit(ies)? l. What is the client's developmental history (including intellectual, physical, emotional, etc.)? Include all significant developmental/childhood experiences, markers, & challenges. What is the impact of the client's developmental history on his/her/their current life? m. Does the client have any relevant intimate relationship history? What is the influence of the relationship history? n. Strengths & challenges. What are the client's key strengths? How does the client protect themselves from anxiety & stress? What self-soothing or self-regulation strategies does the client use? What resources or obstacles facilitate or inhibit the client's management of current issues? o. Does the client have any previous experiences with clinical or psychological services? How did he/she/they experience them (strengths, challenges, etc.)? Describe relevant history & current contexts. p. Does the client have any involvement in legal or social services? Describe relevant history & current contexts. What is the impact of the legal/social involvement on the client's life? q. Which social, institutional, & local policies are implicated in this case? What is the impact of these policies on the client's ability to cope with the current issue(s) or to access necessary services or resources? What is the client's understanding of this impact?
F. Safety assessment.	Is the client in danger to self or others? If so, has the safety plan been constructed, documented, & implemented? (*Students must report any safety concerns to the practicum instructor & follow the agency protocol regarding safety*.)

Table 3c. *Paper 1: Theoretical Case Formulation*

Section	Objective(s)
G. Theoretical Case Formulation	The main task of this section is to draw a theory-informed analysis of the case, i.e., "I think this is what is going on in this case, & these are theories that help me understand what the client is experiencing." Which theories (use theories from HBSE, Human Development, and/or Social Justice classes) help you understand what this client is experiencing? Use no *more than three* theories so that you can engage in deeper analysis. Briefly summarize what the theory says (i.e., what are some tenets that are relevant in this case?) & describe how it helps you better understand what the client may be experiencing & the context of his/her/their experience.

Table 4. *Paper 2: Research & Theory Informed Intervention*

SAMPLE ASSIGNMENT 2: Research- & Theory-informed Intervention (Part 2 of the Case Study Assignment) **Paper 2: Research & Theory Informed Intervention**	
Section	**Objective(s)**
A. Theory-informed intervention	Discuss how the theories you used in the Case Formulation section inform you about the direction of intervention. Please make a specific link between the theory & the intervention.
B. The Best Research Evidence	Conduct literature review of relevant literature (library research) to find the intervention models/strategies that are most likely to be effective for the client. Discuss how they may be applied to your intervention with this client. Include critical analysis of evidence-based interventions in the context of social justice & cultural relevance for the client.
C. Drawing upon the theories & the research evidence, describe your plan for intervention.	a. Identify & discuss your treatment goals & treatment methods, separating immediate from long term. How would you collaborate with your client on the treatment planning? What would be the core elements of a treatment contract with this client? Are these interventions likely to be accepted by the client? Are there elements that might be uncomfortable or unacceptable to the client? Are the interventions realistically available & can they be funded? b. What social justice-oriented social change goals can be part of, or related to, your work with the client? What resources might you mention to the client as ways to promote the changes they wish to help make? What resources might you help connect the client with to promote these changes? What client-centered advocacy would you engage? How might you work to promote social changes, including policy changes, related to this client & case? c. Use your agency' treatment plan template OR sample templates discussed in class to write up a treatment plan that would be appropriate for your agency's context. d. What support would you need from your practicum instructor?