

SOWK 7125: FOUNDATION SOCIAL WORK FIELD EDUCATION

3 Semester Credits

The University of Georgia
School of Social Work
Athens, Georgia

Spring Semester 2019

Instructor:	Office Hours:
Location:	Office Info:
Class time:	Email:

Please note: The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary.

We are committed to addressing **power** and **oppression** in society in order to promote **social justice** by using **evidence informed practice** and **advocacy** tools and the celebration of **diversity**. This philosophy, under the acronym, **PrOSEAD**, acknowledges that engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities requires an understanding of the historical and contemporary interrelationships in the distribution, exercise, and access to power and resources for different populations. Our role is to promote the well-being of these populations using the best and most appropriate tools across the micro, mezzo or macro levels of social work practice. In short, our values include a commitment to:

Addressing	P ower and
Promoting	O ppression,
Using	S ocial justice,
Celebrating	E vidence-informed practice and
	A dvocacy, and
	D iversity

- P**ower - Certain sections of populations are more privileged than others in accessing resources due to historical or contemporary factors related to class, race, gender, etc. Our curriculum will prepare students to: (i) identify and acknowledge privilege issues both in society as well as at the practitioner/client level; (ii) have this understanding inform their practice In order to competently serve clients who experience disenfranchisement and marginalization.
- O**ppression - Social work practice across the micro-macro spectrum should work to negate the effects of oppression or acts of oppression locally, nationally and globally. Our curriculum will prepare students to enhance the empowerment of oppressed groups and prevent further oppression among various populations within the contexts of social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental frameworks that exist
- S**ocial Justice -interpersonal violence Social workers understand that human rights and social justice, as well as social welfare and services, are mediated by policy and its implementation at the federal, state, and local levels. Our curriculum will prepare students to engage in policy practice at the local, state, federal, or international levels in

- order to impact social justice, well-being, service delivery, and access to social services of our clients, communities and organizations.
- d. **Evidence Informed Practice** – Social workers understand that the clients’ clinical state is affected not only by individual-level factors but also by social, economic, and political factors. We are also cognizant that research shows varied levels of evidence for practice approaches with various clients or populations. Our curriculum will prepare students to engage in evidence-informed practice. This includes finding and employing the best available evidence to select practice interventions for every client or group of clients, while also incorporating client preferences and actions, clinical state, and circumstances.
 - e. **Advocacy** – Every person regardless of position in society has fundamental human rights to freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Our curriculum will prepare students to apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice and their knowledge of effective advocacy and systems change skills to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels
 - f. **Diversity** - Social workers need to understand how diversity and difference characterize and shape the human experience and are critical to the formation of identity. Our curriculum will produce students who are able to engage, embrace, and cherish diversity and difference across all levels of practice

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course focuses on the application of generalist practice skills in a field setting. Students complete 240 hours at an approved practicum site. Experiential learning with clients affords opportunities to practice a variety of skills (i.e., engagement, assessment, intervention, and termination/evaluation) and apply the NASW Code of Ethics to actual cases. Students learn how to utilize supervision and feedback to improve skills. Students develop an understanding of the organizational context of practice including the impact of policy on service delivery. Small seminars (8-12 students) allow for processing of practicum experiences.

SOCIAL WORK COMPETENCIES AND PRACTICE BEHAVIORS

2.1.1. Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

- a. Make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context
- b. Use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations
- c. Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication
- d. Use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes
- e. Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

2.1.2. Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

- a. Apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels
- b. Present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences
- c. Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies

- 2.1.3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice**
 - a. Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels
 - b. Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice

- 2.1.4. Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice**
 - a. Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research
 - b. Apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings
 - c. Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery

- 2.1.5. Engage in Policy Practice**
 - a. Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services
 - b. Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services
 - c. Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice

- 2.1.6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**
 - a. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies
 - b. Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies

- 2.1.7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**
 - a. Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies
 - b. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies
 - c. Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and
 - d. Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.

- 2.1.8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**
 - a. Critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies
 - b. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies
 - c. Use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes
 - d. Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies
 - e. Facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals

2.1.9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

- a. Select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes
- b. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes
- c. Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes;
- d. Apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

1. Demonstrate professional behavior in a practicum setting including the ability to utilize supervision and feedback (2.1.1.a; 2.1.1.b; 2.1.1.c; 2.1.1.d; 2.1.1.e).
2. Apply the NASW Code of Ethics and ethical frameworks to actual case situations (2.1.1.a; 2.1.1.b, 2.1.2.c).
3. Apply generalist practice skills at all phases of the problem solving process including engagement, assessment, intervention, and termination and evaluation (2.1.6.a; 2.1.6.b; 2.1.7.a; 2.1.7.b; 2.1.7.c; 2.1.7.d; 2.1.8.a; 2.1.8.b; 2.1.8.c; 2.1.8.d; 2.1.8.e; 2.1.9.a; 2.1.9.b; 2.1.9.c; 2.1.9.d).
4. Demonstrate knowledge of relevant policies, organizational structure and functioning of a social service agency (2.1.5.a; 2.1.5.b; 2.1.5.c).
5. Demonstrate advocacy skills to promote social, economic and environmental justice (2.1.3.a; 2.1.3.b; 2.1.5.c; 2.1.8.d).
6. Apply person-in-environment perspective to assess and intervene with clients with an emphasis on external conditions that undermine social, economic justice and environmental justice (2.1.2.a; 2.1.3.a; 2.1.3.b; 2.1.5.c; 2.1.7.b; 2.1.7.d; 2.1.8.a; 2.1.8.b).
7. Embraces diversity and difference as sources of strength in assessment and intervention processes (2.1.1.b; 2.1.2.a; 2.1.2.b; 2.1.2.c).

PREREQUISITE

A grade of B or higher in SOWK 7115.

REQUIRED READINGS

Hepworth, D. H., Rooney, R. H., Rooney, G. D., & Strom-Gottfried, K. (2017). *Direct social work practice: Theory and skills* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage.

Additional readings are noted on the Course Schedule and will be provided by the instructor.

COURSE FORMAT

Small seminar discussion of field experiences (2 hours weekly), lecture, experiential learning at field site (240 hours).

COURSE POLICIES

ADA Statement:

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990), The University of Georgia School of Social Work seeks to provide equal access to individuals with disabilities. Students who have a disability and need specific accommodations and support to facilitate full inclusion in all aspects of the course should make an appointment with the instructor during the first week of the term. To register for services, students may contact the Disability Resource Center located in Clark Howell Hall (706-542-8719, TTY 706-542-8778, <https://drc.uga.edu/>).

Academic Honesty:

As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to abide by the University's academic honesty policy, "A Culture of Honesty," and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards described in "A Culture of Honesty" found at: <https://honesty.uga.edu/Academic-Honesty-Policy/> Lack of knowledge of the academic honesty policy is not a reasonable explanation for a violation. Questions related to course assignments and the academic honesty policy should be directed to the instructor.

Ethics and Confidentiality:

The NASW *Code of Ethics* is intended to serve as a guide for the everyday professional conduct of social workers. You are expected to be familiar with its contents. The *Code* is online at <https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics-English>

Non-Discrimination Statement:

The University's Non-Discrimination policy reads as follows:

"The University of Georgia ("the University") is committed to maintaining a fair and respectful environment for living, work and study. To that end, and in accordance with federal and state law, University System of Georgia policy, and University policy, the University prohibits harassment of or discrimination against any person because of race, color, sex (including sexual harassment and pregnancy), sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnicity or national origin, religion, age, genetic information, disability, or veteran status by any member of the University Community (as defined below) on campus, in connection with a University program or activity, or in a manner that creates a hostile environment for any member of the University Community. Incidents of harassment and discrimination will be met with appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal or expulsion from the University." (<https://eoo.uga.edu/policies/non-discrimination-anti-harassment-policy>).

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION

Due to the nature of this course and its focus on experiential learning, attendance for all class sessions and scheduled practicum days is expected. Engaged participation in class and field are required. Learning in this course bridges social work theory and skills with the world of practice. Learning is interconnected and maximized when everyone participates fully in field placement along with graduate level reflection and discourse. Students should be prepared to

engage in synthesis and analysis of readings along with reflection and discussion of field work practice behaviors.

If a student must miss class, they are responsible for contacting the instructor prior to class and must still turn in all work on time unless other arrangements are made with the instructor. Assignments are due at the beginning of the class session when the assignment is due. Late work will be accepted for half-credit up to one week late; work later than one week will NOT be accepted.

Students are required to complete 16 hours per week with their assigned field practicum agency beginning for the full duration of the semester (240 hours total). If a student must miss practicum, they are responsible for contacting their field instructor or designated agency contact. All missed hours must be made up. Field Education policies and procedures are available in the Field Manual which can be accessed at http://ssw.uga.edu/academics/field/msw_field_resources.html

Failing to complete the requisite number of practicum hours and/or being absent from class will impact one's course grade. In extreme instances, this will result in assigning the grade of "F" for the course. **Attendance and participation in this course are worth 25 points.** There is no provision for extra credit in this course. MSW students must earn a minimum grade of B or better in SOWK 7125 in order to advance to the specialization practicum (SOWK 7225). Students cannot enter specialization practicum with Incompletes (I) in any course.

ASSIGNMENTS

Case Study Paper (20 points)

Each student will create a written document (between 5-7 pages) based on a client family system served at their practicum site. Successful papers will address the following:

1. Description of the client system
2. Assessment at micro, mezzo, and macro levels
3. Development of an intervention plan
4. Intervention
5. Termination and evaluation of services

The case study paper must be in a written format consistent with the practicum agency report culture. This may include, but not be limited to, APA Style Guidelines (6th Edition). In order to determine this, students should review a sample agency report and model their paper formatting accordingly.

Case Study and Advocacy Presentation (20 points)

Each student will create a presentation based on the case study client family system that they wrote about in the case study paper. Successful presentations will address all of the components identified for the paper. In addition, students will select an advocacy action or process that they have done or wish to do in the future with, for, or on behalf of a client or clients.

Advocacy is an essential skill for all social workers to help advance social and economic justice for our clients and social service programs. Advocating occurs at both micro and macro levels with the aim of eliminating or decreasing barriers for opportunities and the aim of creating opportunities for marginalized and oppressed people. Advocating can be viewed on a continuum from can be helping a client secure needed services or goods, changing agency policies, to changing local, regional or national policies. Advocating can take the form of speaking with others on behalf of a client in a collaborative empowering process to exercising political or organizational influence or through community organizing.

Please follow the directions as outlined below for this presentation:

1. Prepare a 25-30 minute presentation presenting your case study and featuring your advocacy action or idea.
2. Include a description of the client system; assessment at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels; the process of developing an intervention plan and the intervention itself; termination and evaluation of services.
3. Include a description of your advocacy efforts, process, the collaborative partners, as well as your rationale.
4. Describe the achieved, intended, and/or unintended outcome(s).
5. Analyze and describe any barriers to implementation.
6. Provide two critical thinking questions as a basis for class discussion.

Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student & Timesheet (35 points)

Evaluation of the student is an on-going process. A student continually receives feedback on his/her performance from the field instructor, task supervisor (where appropriate), and assigned faculty liaison. Field instructors are required to complete a written final evaluation at the end of the semester. *The Foundation Field Final Evaluation of Student and Timesheet of Practicum Hours* forms are available on the School of Social Work Field Education webpage (http://ssw.uga.edu/academics/field/msw_field.html).

It is the student's responsibility to provide the evaluation form to their field instructor in a timely fashion and inform the field instructor of the May 1 deadline to have the evaluation completed. It is important that all fields on the evaluation be completed in a thorough manner. The field instructor is responsible for completing the written evaluation and discussing the completed instrument with the student. Both the student and field instructor must sign the evaluation. This document is not complete without all signatures affixed. During the final site visit the written evaluation will be reviewed.

It is the student's responsibility to usher the evaluation process forward and submit needed materials to the necessary parties. On or before **May 1, 2019**, students must submit a copy of the completed and signed evaluation and practicum hours timesheet as follows:

1. SOWK 7125 faculty member/faculty liaison
2. Field Office – delivered to 113 Social Work Building or emailed to sswfield@uga.edu
3. Students should retain a copy of these documents for their personal records

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week	Topics Covered
1	Overview of course and review of syllabus
2	Readings: Hepworth et al. (2017) pp. 79-87; Reamer (2005b); Reamer (2013); NASW Code of Ethics Ethical Framework for Resolving Dilemmas Discussion of Field Experiences Gwinnett Sections: Specialization Pre-Field Orientation 5:30 – 6:30 (Room 108)
3	Discussion of Field Experiences
4	Readings: Bride (2007); Hepworth et al. pp. 542-543; Smith (2014); Please see: “Our Self-Care Starter Kit” at https://socialwork.buffalo.edu/resources/self-care-starter-kit.html Self-Care Discussion of Field Experiences
5	Discussion of Field Experiences
6	Readings: Blundo (2001); Hepworth et al. (2017) pp. 194-195; Saleebey (1996) Strength-Based Practice Discussion of Field Experiences
7	Discussion of Field Experiences
8	Reading: Thyer & Myers (2010) Evidence Based Practice Discussion of Field Experiences
9	Discussion of Field Experiences
10	Readings Hepworth et al. (2017) pp. 572-584 Termination Process Discussion of Field Experiences
11	Case Study & Advocacy Presentations
12	Case Study & Advocacy Presentations
13	Case Study & Advocacy Presentations
14	Case Study & Advocacy Presentations
15	Wrap Up

COURSE GRADES

Letter Grade	Numerical Score
A	94-100pts
A-	90-93pts
B+	87-89pts
B	84-86pts
B-	80-83pts
C+	77-79pts
C	73-76pts
C-	70-72pts
D	65-69pts
F	64pts & below
I	Incomplete

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Blumenfeld, W. J., Castañeda, C. R., Hackman, H. W., Peters, M. L., & Zúñiga, X. (2010). *Readings for diversity and social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Ames, N. (1999). Social work recording: A new look at an old issue. *Social Work, 35*(2), 227-237.
- Ames, N. (2016). Writing clearly for clients: What social workers should know. *Social Work, 61*(2), 167-169. doi:10.1093/sw/sww008
- Barlow, C., & Hall, B. L. (2007). "What about feelings?" A study of emotion and tension in social work field education. *Social Work Education, 26*(4), 399-413.
- Barretti, M. (2004). The professional socialization of undergraduate social work students. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 9*(2), 9-30.
- Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2007). Teaching social work students to resolve ethical dilemmas in domestic violence. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 27*, 1-2, 73-88.
- Blundo, R. (2001). Learning strengths-based practice: Challenging our personal and professional frames. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Services, 82*(3), 296-304. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.192>
- Bogo, M., Globerman, J., & Sussman, T. (2004) The field instructor as group worker: Managing trust and competition in group supervision. *Journal of Social Work Education, 40*(1), 13-26.
- Boyle, S. W., Hull, Jr., G. H. Mather, J. H., Smith, L. L., Farley, O. W. (2009). *Direct practice in social work* (2nd ed.) Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Bride, B. (2007). Prevalence of secondary traumatic stress among social workers. *Social Work, 52*(1), 63-70.

- Bride, B. E., Jones, J. L., & Macmaster, S. A. (2007). Correlates of secondary traumatic stress in child protective services workers. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 4(3/4), 69-60.
- Brun, C., & Rapp, R. C. (2001). Strengths-based case management: Individuals' perspectives on strengths and the case manager relationship. *Social Work*, 46(3):278-288.
- Butler, L. D., Carello, J., & Maguin, E. (2017). Trauma, stress, and self-care in clinical training: predictors of burnout, decline in health status, secondary traumatic stress symptoms, and compassion satisfaction. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 9(4), 416-424. doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000187>
- Colvin, A. (2013). Building culturally competent social work field practicum students through the integration of Campinha-Bacote's cultural competence healthcare model. *The Field Educator*, 3.1(1), 1-13. Available online at <http://fieldeducator.simmons.edu/>
- Congress, E. (2000). What social workers should know about ethics: Understanding and resolving practice dilemmas. *Advances in Social Work*, 1, 1, 1-22.
- Corrigan, P. W. (2007) How clinical diagnosis might exacerbate the stigma of mental illness. *Social Work* 52(1), 31-39.
- Coyle, S. (2017). Public self-disclosure in social work — Risks and rewards. *Social Work Today*, 17(3), 22. Retrieved from <http://www.socialworktoday.com/archive/052217p22.shtml>
- Dane, B. (2002). Duty to inform: Preparing social work students to understand vicarious traumatization. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 22(3/4), 3-20.
- De Jong, P., & Miller, S. D. (1995). How in interview for client strengths. *Social Work*, 40(6), 729-736.
- Dore, M. M. (1993). The practice-teacher parallel in educating the micropractitioner. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 29(2), 181-190.
- Ericsson, K. A., Nandagopal, K., & Roring, R. W. (2009). Toward a science of exceptional achievement: Attaining superior performance through deliberate practice. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1172, 199-217. DOI: 10.1196/annals.1393.001
- Ericsson, K. A. (2017). Expertise and individual differences: The search for the structure and acquisition of experts' superior performance. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, 8, (1-2), 1-6. doi: 10.1002/wcs.1382
- Furman, R; Jackson R. L., Downey, E. P., & Seiz, R. (2004). Using the biopsychosocial approach to resolve student dilemmas in field placements. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*. 24(1/2), 129-139.
- Gebthard, S. (1995) Legal issues: Confidentiality and privileged communication. *Encyclopedia of social work*, 19th ed., vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press, 1579-1584.

- Gelman C. R. (2004). Anxiety experienced by foundation-year MSW students entering field placement: Implications for admissions, curriculum, and field education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 40(1), 39-54.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2004.10778478>
- Gelman, C. R. (2011). Field instructors' perceptions on foundation year MSW students' preplacement anxiety. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 31(1), 295-312.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2011.580252>
- Gitterman, A. (1988). Teaching students to connect theory and practice. *Social Work with Groups*, 11(1/2), 33-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J009v11n01_03
- Glisson, C. (2007). Assessing and changing organizational culture and climate for effective services. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17(6), 736-747.
 DOI: 10.1177/1049731507301659
- Goldstein, H. (1986). Education for social work practice: A cognitive, cross-cultural approach. *International Social Work*, 29, 149-164.
- Gorin, S. H. (2000). Inequality and health: Implications for social work. *Health and Social Work*, 25(4), 270-275. doi: 10.1093/hsw/25.4.270
- Gourdine, R. M. (2004). A beginning professional's journey toward understanding equality and social justice in the field of social work. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping*, 10(1), 73-81.
- Guggenbühl-Craig, A. (1971). *Power in the helping professions*. Dallas, TX: Spring Publications.
- Guzda, H. P. (1980). Frances Perkins' interest in a new deal for blacks. *Monthly Labor Review*, 103(4), 31-35.
- Holosko, M., & Skinner, J. (2015). A call for field coordination leadership to implement the signature pedagogy. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 25, 275-283.
- Hughes, M., & Wearing, M. (2007). Social work in organisations, In M. Hughes & M. Wearing, *Organisations and management in social work*, (pp. 9-31), London: Sage.
- Hyde, C. A., & Cohen, M. B. (2016). Characteristics and culture of human service organizations. In M. B. Cohen & C. A. Hyde (Eds.), *Empowering workers and clients for organizational change* (pp. 3-19). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kantor, J. (2007). Compassion fatigue and secondary traumatization: A second look. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 35, 289-293.
- Lawton, M. P., & Brody, E. M. (1969). Assessment of older people: Self-Maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *Gerontologist*, 9, 179-186.
- Lister, L. (1987). Contemporary direct practice roles. *Social Work*, 32(5), 384-391.
- Maltzman, S. (2011). An organizational self-care model: Practical suggestions for development

- and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39(2), 303-319.
- Messinger, L. (2004). Out in the field: Gay and lesbian social work students' experiences in field placement. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 40(2), 187-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2004.10778489>
- National Association of Social Workers. (2013). *Guidelines for social worker safety in the workplace*. Washington, D. C.: Author. Retrieved from: <https://www.socialworkers.org/practice/naswstandards/safetystandards2013.pdf>
- Poulin J., Silver P., & Kauffman S. (2006). Serving the community and training social workers: service outputs and student outcomes. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 42(1), 171-184.
- Reamer, F. G. (1987). Informed consent in social work. *Social Work*, 32(5), 425-429.
- Reamer, F. G. (2003). Boundary issues in social work: Managing dual relationships. *Social Work*, 48(1), 121-133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/48.1.121>
- Reamer, F. G. (2005a). Documentation in social work: Evolving ethical and risk-management standards. *Social Work*, 50(4), 325-334.
- Reamer, F. G. (2005b). Ethical and legal standards in social work: Consistency and conflict. *Families in Society*, 86, 163-169.
- Reamer, F. G. (2013) Social work in a digital age: Ethical and risk management challenges. *Social Work*, 58(2), 163-172. doi:10.1093/sw/swtOO
- Reamer, F. G. (2014). The evolution of social work ethics: Bearing witness. *Advances in Social Work*, 15(1), 163-181.
- Saleebey, D. (1996). The strengths perspective in social work practice: Extensions and cautions. *Social Work*, 41(3): 296-305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/41.3.296>
- Savaya, R. (2010). Enhancing student awareness of the importance of full and accurate documentation in social work practice. *Social Work Education*, 29(6), 660-669. doi: 10.1080/02615470903552006
- Scholar, H. (2013). Dressing the part? The significance of dress in social work. *Social Work Education*, 32(3), 365-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.667798>
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. J. (2017). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Dædalus*, 134(3), 52-59.
- Stevenson, S (2004). Sweethearts and sourpusses: My year with the elderly. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* 44(1/2): 53-80.
- Simmons, C. S., Diaz, L., Jackson, V., & Takahashi, R. (2008). NASW cultural competence indicators: A new tool for the social work profession. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 17(1), 4-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15313200801904869>

- Smith, M. (2014). Compassion fatigue in social work students. *Field Educator*, 4.1(1), 1-4.
Retrieved from http://www2.simmons.edu/ssw/fe/i/Students_Speak_Smith.pdf
- Strom-Gottfried, K. (2003). Understanding adjudication: Origins, targets, and outcomes of ethics complaints. *Social Work*, 48(1):85-94.
- Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (1999). *The elements of style*. (4th ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thyer, B. A., & Myers, L. L. (2010). The quest for evidence-based practice: A view from the United States. *Journal of Social Work*, 11(1), 8-25. doi 10.1177/1468017310381812