

The Implementation of Cultural Competencies in Field Practicum Learning Contracts: An Exploratory Study

Betty Blackmon¹, MSW, JD

Abstract

This article represents an exploratory study of graduate school social work student's field practicum learning contracts. In particular, we examined the contracts for the presence of activities that address the principles of cultural competence. In 2008, The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) reiterated its stance promoting Educational Policy Standards' (EPAS) and again in 2015 that mandated social work educators to train students in diversity and cultural competency. In addition, the National Association of Social Work and others provide competencies and Code of Conduct guidelines that require that all social workers strive for cultural competence in their practice. This study used content analysis to examine field placement learning contracts for indicators of cultural competence in a school of social work.

Introduction

Twenty first century social work practice involves social workers engaged in practice with diverse and multicultural populations. The populations that range from an individual to multiple organizations. Graduate students in social work programs receive theoretical instruction in the classroom but must also understand the application of theory to practice. Thus, social work students are called to integrate the concepts learned in classrooms with their field practicum settings. These practicum settings are varied and range from direct practice to policy and advocacy. The hypothetical becomes reality when students are required by their field practicum to engage in social work practice with individuals, groups, families, organizations, and communities that are diverse and different from themselves (Appleby, G., Colon, E., & Hamilton, J., 2011, Doel, M., Shardlo, S., & Johnson, P., 2011, Horejsi, & Garthwait, 2002).

Social work practitioners are expected to competently interact with populations whose diversity consist of, but are not limited to, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, language, religion, class, ableism, age, and mental challenges (Counoyer, B.R., 2017). Social work students must learn to implement the complex concepts of diversity and cultural competence while the profession continues to grapple with a clear definition of these terms (Garran & Rozas, 2013, Krentzman, A., & Townsend, A., 2008). This expectation is established by the current Council on Social Work Education standards requiring students to demonstrate the mastery of these concepts in their field practicum (CSWE, 2015). These standards on cultural competencies are involved in the education of social workers, and field practicums are the primary vehicle for students to integrate materials learned in the classroom about cultural competency and to apply them to generalist practice with diverse and multicultural populations (citation). Field placements use the field learning contract to guide the education of the student and implement social work education competencies (Bogo, 2002). The learning contract becomes the vehicle for bringing together classroom and practice.

The learning contract is an ongoing learning tool that outline the activities undertaken in field practicums including the measurement of student progress toward developing cultural competence. Specific goals, objectives, and activities in the learning contract enable the student, field liaison, and field supervisor to track and measure the student's ability to implement mutually agreed upon learning strategies (Royse, D., Dhooper, S., & Rompf, E., 2003).

¹ Associate Professor, University of Missouri Kansas City School of Social Work, 5030 Cherry Hall Suite 237
Kansas City, Missouri 64110, Email address blackmonb@umkc.edu

It will further the call for social workers in the Twenty –first Century to practice with consciousness, commitment, confidence, and competence on behalf of diverse populations (Anderson and Wiggins, Carter, 2003) when practice activities are clearly identified in the learning contract. However, little practical information exists to guide field instructors in the incorporation of diversity and cultural issues into the learning contracts (Armour, Bain & Rubie, 2004; Arkin, 1999; Cashwell Looby & Housley, 1997; Levigg & Wagner, 1994).

One controversy that continues to plague the profession is the definition of cultural competence. At the end of the 20th century, cultural competence for some remains more of an abstract ideal than a measurable outcome of social work education (Carrizales, T., 2017, Leavitt, R., 2010, NASW, 2003, Boyle and Springer, 2001). However, the definition of cultural competence used by most practitioners describes it as congruent behaviors, attitudes and policies that allow professionals to work effectively with diverse cross cultural, and diverse linguistics circumstances (Abernathy, 2005; Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaac, 1989). Contrary to some, this definition does offer enough information about cultural competency to provide a guideline for establishing activities to implement cultural competency in the learning contract. Due to the rapidly increasing numbers of culturally diverse persons in the United States, there is an urgent need for institutions of higher education to produce professionals equipped to provide appropriate and effective service (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). This study's focus on how well cultural competence and diversity training is occurring within the context of the field practicum using the mutually agreed upon goals and activities incorporated into the field practicum learning contracts. A research opportunity that is needed to further the implementation of cultural competency into practice. It is field practicum where the goals and activities of cultural competency are incorporated into the learning contract and are used to operationalize these concepts that are required by (CSWE, 2015).

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What activities comprise the cultural competence portion of the graduate social work students' practicum contract?
2. Is there a discernable pattern to the types of activities placed on graduate student social work practicum learning contracts?

Methodology

Content analysis was determined to be the most appropriate method of answering the research questions. The field of social work has seen similar studies that have utilized this methodology to examine curriculum, course data, and program standards (Drisko, 2008; Lester & Van Fleet, 2008). Content analysis has been described as the "systematic, quantitative description of the composition of the object of the study." (Gay, 1992, p. 236). It involves systematic coding for qualitative data in order to do a quantitative analysis (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). More simplistically, (Holsti, 1969) suggests that content analysis is a technique used to examine documents. Content analysis allows the researcher to examine documents for recurring words or phrases and ultimately make judgments regarding their meaning. (Holsti, 1969) goes on to identify three approaches to content analysis: 1) make inferences about the antecedents of a communication; 2) describe and make inferences about characteristics of the communication; and 3) make inferences about the effects of a communication. Each of these approaches would examine the existing data with a slightly different lens. We chose the second approach as the most appropriate to answer our research questions.

Krippendorff (1980) provides six questions that should be answered when doing content analysis:

1. Which data is analyzed?
2. How is it defined?
3. What is the population from which they it is drawn?
4. What is the context relative to which the data is analyzed?
5. What are the boundaries of the analysis?
6. What is the target of the inferences?

We utilized this process as we developed the Coding criteria used to examine the student learning contracts. For this study, learning contracts of second year graduate social work students were examined. In particular, we examined the diversity objectives that were prescribed in each student contract.

Coding for analyzing the learning contracts required the developing and refinement of the criterion that will be used to measure cultural competency and diversity. A variety of material was used to develop the Coding criteria. The criteria were the result of a variety of sources. Those sources included cultural competency and diversity literature from social work and others.

These materials were synthesized and integrated into the coding criteria ensuring that the criterion was based on the professional standards. In addition, material from the social work accreditation group, the National Association of Social Work (NASW, 2001), the field instructors and the field administrators who developed the actual learning contracts were reviewed and incorporated into the Coding criteria that will be used to conduct the content analysis of the learning contracts.

Sample

In order to complete the content analysis, permission was given to access the learning contracts for 100 second year graduate students enrolled at an urban research institution in the Midwest. Students develop the learning contracts in consultation with their faculty advisor and field supervisor. They then carry out the activities over the course of a semester. Since this is an exploratory study, we randomly selected twenty learning contracts to manually review and code.

We began the process by reviewing the prescribed field practicum diversity competencies goals and activities that were developed by the institution's social work field instructors, and the field practicum administrators based on the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Educational Policy Standards (EPAS), and the social work and other literature available. These competencies were divided into five competencies. The five competencies identified from the contracts were: 1) refine professional understanding of the interlocking and complex nature of cultural and personal identity to advance the quality of social work practice and that of social work profession; 2) apply critical thinking: analyzing and evaluation; 3) recognize difference within and between groups and demonstrate appropriate autonomy and proficiency in the differential use of assessment, planning, intervention, advocacy, and research skills for effective advanced practice with persons from diverse backgrounds; 4) practice advance generalist social work without discrimination and respect knowledge and skills as a culturally competent practitioner related to clients; age, class, color, culture, mental and physical ability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation; and 5) practice as a cultural and sensitive social worker.

The five competencies were derived from the Educational Policy Standards (EPAS) of the Council on Social Work Education. A social work education based on the interpretation of the EPAS standards can assist in guiding the student through their learning, training, and understanding of the profession (Elpers, K., FitzGerald, E.A., 2013, p. 298). Competencies are derived from the EPAS are included in each student contract with concomitant activities designated to meet the competencies developed by field instructors and the faculty of the social work practicum. The integration of EPAS into these activities permit the student to move forward in the implementation at the practicum setting. The implementation of this study recognized that the interpretation by the different field instructors would later need to be controlled in subsequent studies. The development and implementation of defined and coded criteria that was consistent would answer the research questions for this study. Consistency in the analysis was controlled by the use of the same reviewers of the contract.

Next, the author studied alternative ways of further defining and clarifying the competencies to further consistency. As stated earlier, the competencies could have multiple interpretations. One method used to control for this phenomenon as to use the adjectives incorporated into the competency statements as key words or phrases that we would look for in the assigned activities. We also brainstormed the various types of activities that might appear in the contracts with practitioners and social work students. After discussion and deliberation, both activities and key words and phrases were used as a coding framework, including five goals, for the examination of the learning contracts. This approach was based on a review of the literature, the expertise and practical experience of the researcher, and practitioners in the field.

In order to provide consistency in the review of the contracts, the group met four times to discuss our understanding of the goals and our coding system. Words, phrases, and concepts were clarified and interpretation agreed upon. A coding rubric was developed, which included the five goals with the key words in parenthesis as descriptors (See Appendix 1). In the next step we reviewed the learning contracts using the five goals as a framework. Each activity in the contract was examined for phrases or concepts that would fit one or more of the five goals.

After coding the contracts individually, we met to discuss our placement of the activities within the coding framework. The group discussed any differences we had in the coding of the activities and came to agreement on placement of the activities within the coding framework.

One limitation of reviewing only the explicit text of the contracts is that we could not determine the implicit activities that often accompany learning contracts. Conversations between the student and the field supervisor, experiences that may spring from contracted activities, and incidental contact may significantly increase the cultural experience. However, I felt the content analysis of the contracts was the most effective manner to evaluate explicit culturally based learning goals.

Findings

A wide variance was found in how contract activities were written for the 1sample students selected. The variance spanned from written broad statements of support for diversity to specific activities the students were to accomplish within specific timeframes. Given this broad spectrum of stated contract activities, some interpretation of intent was required for the broad statements. For example, one contract activity asked the student to “work with” the various constituencies and “make a concerted effort” to keep the perspective of the client in mind. The lack of specificity in what the student is required to do hindered evaluation of the contract activity. Determining where this contract activity should be placed within the five goals was difficult.

The results of the content analysis indicate that graduate students, their advisors, and field supervisors select activities that are limited to two or three of the social work program goals for diversity. Each learning contract included three to five activities students were to complete and be graded on for the academic year. A total of 54 contract activities were reviewed for the sampled twenty students. Content analysis revealed that, of those 54 contract activities, 44 were directed toward competency number one; *refine professional understanding of the interlocking and complex nature of cultural and personal identity to advance the quality of social work practice*. Many of the activities categorized in this goal asked students to go to diversity workshops and complete readings on diversity topics.

The next competency most often addressed in the content analysis of the learning contracts was number three; *recognize differences within and between groups and demonstrate appropriate autonomy and proficiency in the differential use of assessment, planning, intervention, advocacy, and research skills for effective advanced practice with persons from diverse backgrounds*. Eight of the contract activities were categorized under this program goal. Students were asked to complete home visits and discussing the influence of treatment on a specific population.

The remaining activities were grouped under competency four; *practice advanced generalist social work without discrimination and respect knowledge and skills as culturally competent practitioner related to client's age, class, color, culture, mental and physical ability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation*. Activities under this category included developing specific interventions for specific populations and working with groups.

Our content analysis of the learning contracts found no activities that could be categories under competencies two or five.

Table 1

Competency 1 Goals Met	Competency 2 Goals Met	Competency 3 Goals Met	Competency 4 Goals Met	Competency 5 Goals Met
44	0	8	2	0

Discussion

This exploratory study sought to discover what activities comprise the diversity portion of the learning contracts and if there is a discernable pattern to the types of activities placed on graduate student social work practicum contracts. Both of these questions were answered to varying degrees. We will discuss the findings that address each question. The importance of answering the question regarding the types of activities that were included in the learning contracts addresses questions raised by previous researchers in social work education. A recent writing suggested that the CSWE standards on diversity are vague (Roberts & Smith, 2002). If the standards are vague, will the preliminary findings from graduate social work students learning contracts include diversity activities that are based on the standards? The finding affirmed students, field liaisons, and field instructors were able to identify some diversity activities and include them in the learning contracts. The information as to the type of activities reflect few activities that will lead to exemplary practice with others who are different.

Although, the students, field liaisons, and field instructors were able to identify some diversity activities they were comprised of gaining information and awareness. The literature suggest that it is not just the inclusion of a few diversity activities, but that the activities are to follow guidelines about the types of activities that should be included. The guidelines consistently offered in the literature include awareness, information, and knowledge regarding the history of various cultural and diverse groups, beliefs, traditions, knowledge of oppression, and discrimination influences upon the individual and group, basic knowledge of the strategies, theories and interventions that are known to be effective with this population (Sue, 2007, Lum, 2003, Devore and Schlesinger, 2006). Based on these scholar's writings, gaining information and awareness is not effective in working with diverse populations, something more is needed.

The content analysis results indicate graduate students, their field liaisons, and field supervisors selected activities geared toward readings, workshops, and seminars as the primary ways to learn about diversity. Most of the activities were located under the first competency; *refine professional understanding of the interlocking and complex nature of cultural and personal identity to advance the quality of social work practice*. Some of the activities listed in the contracts included attending a workshop on Native Americans, and the reading of an article, such as a single article on Holocaust survivors, which are practical applications of the competencies. This finding is supported by other researchers' recommendations that competent social work practice requires cultural awareness and knowledge (Lum, 2007, Julia, 2000). The seminars and workshops listed by the students did not include a description of them, which limited the researchers' ability to make a determination that historical knowledge, appropriate interventions, and self-awareness are a part of the seminar and workshops, so they were included as information and knowledge development. The literature that describes the training and education of social workers always recommended the inclusion of self-awareness and knowledge of other cultures (Lum; Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1995, Boyle, & Springer, 2001, Nybell, & Gray, 2004).

Although this is a preliminary exploration of social work education's implementation of diversity in learning contracts, the findings support the notion that students, field liaisons, and field instructors are including the acquisition of knowledge and awareness of diverse populations. This knowledge is an important step in a continuing process of social work education because the awareness and knowledge of diverse population obtained from the literature and workshops maybe the initial basis for more complex investigation and support of diversity issues.

The literature is replete with suggestions and opinions that social worker preparation goes beyond cultural awareness and include the different levels of awareness. The literature suggests that diversity and cultural competence education include the development of specific knowledge of diverse populations' beliefs and traditions, awareness, interventions, and self-awareness. Additionally, the influences of discrimination and oppression upon groups, intra-group difference, the impact of various populations' experiences upon the helping process, and information regarding the need to adopt and revise traditional helping strategies are essential knowledge for social workers to become culturally competent and go beyond awareness (CSWE, 2015, Fellin, 2000: Garcia & Van Soest, 1997, Guy-Walls, 2005, Lum. 2003 (4)).

The competency containing the second most activities included in the contracts was number four; *Practice advance generalist social work without discrimination and respect knowledge and skills as a culturally competent practitioner related to clients' age, class, color, culture, mental and physical ability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation*. Students', field liaisons,' and field instructors' inclusion of activities under this category support the guidelines and mandates by two significant social work organizations, NASW and CSWE. These two groups encourage and mandate social workers to respect differences and engage diversity and difference in practice (NASW, 2001; CSWE, 2015).

The activities listed under standard four include broad general terms. For example, "working with" the various constituencies and "make a concerted effort to keep the perspective of the client in mind. The researcher, based on her experience, concluded that "working with" would be included under goal number four and reflect the possibility that this means working with clients. The reasoning that led to the placement of these activities under this category is based on the researcher's experience with social work practice language that refers to social work practice with clients as "working with".

The vague and general nature of the learning contracts language involving practice does not support a finding that students, liaisons, and field instructors are including the development of culturally appropriate strategies, interventions, and activities in the learning contract. The student's utilization of the generalized term "working with" may hamper them in developing a learning process that would enable them to identify the issues related to the appropriateness of theories, interventions, and strategies for diverse populations. The researchers recognize that this may be occurring in supervisory sessions.

However, clearly described inclusion of client related activities are essential to social work education because this is a mechanism by which the student, field liaison, and the field supervisor can assess and modify the learning contract, as needed, to reflect growth and progress of the student (Birkenmaier J. & Berg-Weger, M., 2007).

The ability to think critically is important to social work practice and is an essential social work skill. Critical thinking enables the social worker to analyze the type of services that benefit the client and those that may be discriminatory (Mathias, J., 2015, Gibbs, L., & Gambril, E., 1999). Critical thinking is relevant to culturally diverse social work practice. It is a learning process that includes: 1) formulate, analyze, and assess a problem, question, or issue; 2) segment an argument or assertion into its components (points of view, major concepts and ideas, theories and underlying assumptions, reasoning, interpretations, and implications and consequences (Paul, 1992); 3) differentiate theories about culturally diverse social work practice issues; and 4) build theories of cultural diversity as sources of new knowledge (Lum, 2006). Although this is an important skill for social workers, it is important to note that none of the learning contracts identified critical thinking activities.

The finding that the learning contracts did not include activities under the critical thinking standard underscores the need for students, field liaisons, and field instructors to make special efforts to include the development of critical thinking skills in all activities within the learning contracts. The inclusion of competency two, *critical thinking: analyzing and evaluation*, in learning contracts is equally important to the development of social workers as any other competency. Critical thinking is important for all areas of the helping profession, especially those who engage in direct practice. Social workers who are engaged in helping diverse populations will find it necessary to enhance their thinking; "if you are not assessing your thinking, you are not thinking" (Gibbs, L., & Gambril, E., 1999, *ibid*).

Competency number three, *recognize difference within and between groups and demonstrate appropriate autonomy and proficiency in the differential use of assessment, planning, intervention, advocacy, and research skills for effective advance practice with persons from diverse backgrounds*. This is another standard that assists students in developing practice skills, was absent from all of the learning contracts sampled. The literature supports the concept that there are distinct differences between groups. Therefore, social workers must understand each of these differences within groups if we are to be effective in practice (McRoy, R., & Weaver, H, Lum, 2003). Social work education requires us to understand the ways in which individuality and differences, including help-seeking behavior, are a part of most cultural groups, which, in turn, influences social work practice with diverse populations.

Competency five, *practice as a sensitive social worker*, is embedded in the Council on Social Work Education Standards beginning in 2002 to 2015 (CSWE, 2002-2015) and the National Association of Social Workers Standards for Cultural Competence in Social Work Practice (NASW, 2001) suggesting the importance to the profession. However, the finding that activities to address this standard were not included in the sampling of learning contracts is disturbing. It is disturbing because the lack of inclusion has implications for students learning how to practice effectively with diverse populations. They are not proposing activities to assist them in developing competencies that will assist in operationalizing the principles outlined by CSWE and NASW. This finding suggests a problem with the education of social workers around the concept of cultural awareness that includes a deepening of the knowledge provided to student beyond information and awareness. Students, field liaisons, and field instructors must pay closer attention to the learning contracts because they are an important tool of social work education that support field education goals, objectives, and activities that are used to develop culturally competent social workers. The implementation of specific, measurable goals, objectives and activities will demonstrate and illustrate a working commitment to the diversity and cultural competence principles described by NASW and CSWE (NASW, 2001, and 2015).

Students, field liaisons, and field instructors need to examine learning contracts for their consistency. Consistency in definition, the type, and level of activities and readings on topics that deepen the students understanding about diversity and culture.

Additionally, terms used to describe activities in the contract should be professional social work terminology and not euphemisms such as “working with”. Terms that explain the concepts being developed. The contracts should identify the specific intervention tools that are being used, the writers of the population’s history should be identified.

The readings should be progressive, varying levels of complexity, and specific as to the titles when they are proposed in the learning contract. Readings from the classroom should be integrated into the field placement for the purpose of consistency and avoiding duplication.

Using a variety of articles will avoid using the same one article for an entire year, but permit the introduction of more articles as the semester progresses and students are involved in learning different levels of knowledge about specific populations, which require corresponding skill levels of practice. This will also enable students to learn material that is enriching and varying in depth throughout the school year. The learning contract should require readings that are increasing in complexity that assist students in understanding and complying with the learning contract competencies. Superficial activities will not develop competent social workers and progressive learning goals produce effective learning outcomes.

Practice wisdom and the evidence supports the perception that students learning outcomes that are unfocused and superficial in the areas such as gender, race, sexual orientation, oppression, privilege, abilities and activities that are vague, general, and nonspecific will not produce the desired outcome for the clients being served. The desired outcome for clients that is social justice is excellent care designed to meet their needs especially, the disconnect between available resources and accessibility. Culturally competent practitioners are needed to provide services to the diverse population, but the debate rages on (Gallegos, J., Tindall, C., & Gallegos, S. (2008). Students need to engage in activities that are a part of all of the competencies directing them toward diversity and cultural competence knowledge guidelines. Establishing and following diversity and cultural competency goals will improve social work practice and service delivery to the different populations receiving services from social workers. After all we want to increase the effectiveness of the services provided by social work practitioners by producing competent services.

The findings of this study suggest that a larger study of learning contracts is needed to determine the types and level of diversity and cultural competence activities that are included in them. Are the activities grouped into themes, are the themes based on cultural competency standards in the literature and those outlined by CWSE and NASW. A larger study will provide overall findings to guide social work educators in advancing the education of culturally competent social workers. The findings of the study suggest that the activities may need to be examined for accuracy in meeting the definition of the concepts of diversity and cultural competence. The activities should reflect the complexity of acquiring cultural competence and the requirement of reading very simplistic information or following the experience of the field instructor alone will not accomplish the development of practitioners who can engage in effective practice with varied and diverse populations.

The finding suggest that students are receiving instruction and direction in their field placements around cultural competency is as varied as the field placement and the field instructor and efforts to address this variance needs to be identified and resolved. Again, the findings suggest a need for a larger study to identify how well cultural competence is integrated and implemented into field placements. Anecdotal information about this integration is insufficient to provide social work educators with the need information to improve social work educators with the knowledge to address social work education and cultural competence. This need to conduct a study measuring the extent social workers are involved in culturally competent practice is an issue of integrity and competence for the discipline of social work.

Conclusion

Diversity and cultural competence are not optional according to the National Association of Social Workers and the Council on Social Work Education. Most practitioners recognize their importance to social work education. The strategies and methods for accomplishing this are not as clear. However, students, field liaisons, and field instructors can find books, journals, and published articles that illuminate the concepts of diversity and cultural competence. Field education provides students the opportunity to implement concepts from the classroom. Therefore, social work educators should address this important part of social work education, and assisting with the implementation of cultural competence should be reflective of its importance to the social work student in the Twenty First Century.

It is important that we use the learning contracts to implement diversity and cultural competence standards based on CSWE and NASW competencies. The competencies encourage students, field liaisons, and field instructors to go beyond the primary concentration of awareness and knowledge development activities, such as readings, attendance at workshops, and seminars and that they should carefully observe and reflect when developing what specific activities are listed under each standard. It is important that each of the learning activities be specific and measurable. Specificity and measurable will encourage the evaluation by field liaison and or faculty if we are to know the effectiveness of this integration.

The learning contract should include activities under each diversity and cultural competency standards. These standards may be enhanced by practitioners, the literature, and CSWE guidelines. The activities should reflect current guidelines found in the literature, specifically social work. The student, field liaison, the field instructor should actively engage in identifying activities under each diversity and cultural competency standard, so that the social work field education process reinforces the development of cultural competence in social work practice. Social work practice educators may discuss the learning contract when they discuss cultural competence in the classroom. When this occurs, it becomes a formal process that is essential to the integration of the complexities of culturally competence practitioners as a part of social work education and not an aside, lacking in importance or a difficulty to be addressed somewhere else by someone else.

The development and integration of diversity and cultural competence presents a challenge to social work practitioners and social work educators. It is a Twenty-first Century challenge to all social workers involved in social work education. The challenge is to demonstrate the commitment and ability to develop culturally competent practitioners who successfully work with diverse populations. Social work educators must accept this challenge and relentlessly pursue the education of culturally competent social workers.

Appendix 1

Graduate Social Work

Learning Contract Coding Checklist

Goal 1: Refine professional understanding of the interlocking and complex nature of cultural and personal identity to advance the quality of social work practice and that of the social work profession.

- “Readings” on cultural/racial/personal identity
- “Discussion” on cultural/racial/personal identity
- “Presentations” on cultural/racial identity
- “Attend” training workshops
- “Develop” workshops
- “Read” organization manuals

Goal 2: Apply critical thinking: Analyzing and evaluation

- “Analyzing” social work processes/services
- “Evaluating” social work process/services
- Application of social work processes/services

Goal 3: Recognize differences within and between groups and demonstrate appropriate autonomy and proficiency in the differential use of assessment, planning, intervention, advocacy, and research skills for effective advanced practice with persons from diverse backgrounds.

- “Apply” understanding of differences with intake process/intervention
- “Apply” understanding of differences in research
- “Apply” understanding of social work assessment
- “Apply” understanding of intra differences to social work process

Goal 4: Practice advanced generalist social work without discrimination and respect knowledge and skills as a culturally competent practitioner related to clients’ age, class, color, culture, mental and physical ability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.

- “Intervention.”
- “Practice” w/diverse groups

Goal 5: Practice as a cultural and sensitive social worker.

- “Awareness” of differing cultural characteristics
- “Implement” social work practice principles that address differences

References

- Abernathy, A. (2005). Increasing the cultural proficiency of clinical managers. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33*, 81-93.
- Allen-Mears, P. (2007). Cultural competence: An Ethical Requirement, *Journal of Ethics and Cultural Diversity in Social Work, Vol 16: 3-4*, 83-92.
- Amour, M. & Bain, B., Rubio, R. 2004, Field Education in Social Work an Evaluation Study of Diversity Training for Field Instructors: A collaborative approach to enhancing cultural competence. *Journal of Social Work Education, 40* (1), 27-36.
- Anderson, J. & Carter Wiggins, R. (2003). *Diversity perspectives for social work practice*. Pearson Education, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Appleby, G., Colon E., Hamilton, J., Diversity, Oppression, and Social Functioning-Person-in- Environment, 3rd ed.
- Arkin, N. (1999). Culturally sensitive student supervision: Difficulties and challenges. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*, 1-16.
- Arrendondo, P., & Perez, A. (2006). Historical Perspectives on the Multicultural Guidelines and Contemporary applications. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*, 1-5.
- Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. W. (2010) *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Birkenmaier, J. & Ber-Weger, M. (2007). *The Practicum Companion for Social Work: Integrating class and field work. 2nd Ed.* Pearson Education, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Cashwell, C.S., Looby, E.J. & Housley, W. (1997). *Appreciating Cultural Diversity through Clinical Supervision. The Clinical Supervisor, 15*, 75-85.
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) (2015) *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards CSWE, Alexandria, VA.* <http://www.csweduc.org/>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2001 & 2008). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards. Alexandria, VA: Author.*
- Cross, T.L., Bazron, B.J., Dennis, K.W. & Isaacs, M.R. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care (Vol.1)*. Washington, DC: Child and Adolescent Service system Program Technical Assistance Center.
- Devore, W. and Schlesinger, E. G. (1999). *Ethic-sensitive social work practice. Allyn and Bacon, Needham, MA*
- Drisko, J. W. (2008). How is qualitative research taught at the master's level? *Journal of Social Work Education, 44*(1), 85-101.
- Elpers, K., & FitzGerald, E. A. (2013). Issues and Challenges in Gatekeeping: A Framework for Implementation. *Social Work Education, 32*(3), 286-300. doi:10.1080/02615479.2012.665867
- Gallegos, J., Tindall, C., & Gallegos, S. 2008). The Need for Advancement in the conceptualization of Cultural competence. *Advances in Social Work Vol. 9 No.1 (Spring 2008), 51-62*
- Garcia B., & Van Soest, (1997). Changing perceptions of diversity and oppression: MSW students discuss the effects of a required course. *Journal of Social Work Education, 33*(1), 119-129.
- Gay, L. R., (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Macmillan Publishing Co. New York.
- Gibbs, L., & Gambrell, E. (1999). *Critical thinking for social workers: Exercise for the helping profession. 5th Ed.*, Thousand Oaks, Ca: Pine Forge Press.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, Mass.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. 2nd Ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lester, J. & Van Fleet, C. (2008). Use of professional competencies and standards documents for curriculum planning in Schools of Library and Information Studies Education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 49*(1), 43-69.
- Lum, D. (2004). *Social work practice and people of color: A process-stage approach. 5th Ed.* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Lum, D. (2003). *Culturally Competent Practice: A Framework for Understanding Diverse Groups and Justice Issues.* Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning, Inc. Pacific Grove, CA.

- Lum, D. (1999). *Culturally competent practice: A framework for growth and action*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove, CA.
- Mathias, J., Thinking Like a Social Worker: Examining the Meaning of Critical Thinking in social Work, 51:3, 457
- National Association of Social Workers. (2001). *NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice*. Washington, DC; Author.
- Sue, D. W. (2006). *Multicultural social work practice*. Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Drisko, J. W. (2008). How is qualitative research taught at the master's level? *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(1), 85-101.
- Gay, L. R., (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Macmillan Publishing Co. New York.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, Mass.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. 2nd Ed. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Lester, J. & Van Fleet, C. (2008). Use of professional competencies and standards documents for curriculum planning in Schools of Library and Information Studies Education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 49(1), 43-69.