Chapter 11
Social Justice and Social Work Education

Abstract Social work is a discipline and a profession, and learning about social work typically commences with a course of study in a university or tertiary institution. Hence, teaching and learning about social work is key to a solid consideration of social justice. However, given the complex and contested nature of social justice, the approach to teaching social justice needs to be thought through and systematic. This chapter is focussed on teaching and learning for social justice in social work curriculums. In this chapter, we present 48 learning outcomes that would assist in developing an explicit focus on social justice in social work education. We introduce three curriculum design frameworks, and these are used to structure learning outcomes for social justice. These learning outcomes will be useful for educators, students, practitioners and researchers who aim to incorporate social justice knowledge, values and skills into their practice.

Introduction

Social work is a profession and also an academic discipline and is now '"established on every inhabited continent, and on every continent, organised educational programs in social work have existed for more than half a century' (Healy, 2012, p. 9). This means that social work is applied in practice, but it also is concerned with scholarly activities such as research, theory development, education and learning. Social work has developed its own rich body of disciplinary knowledge as well as adapting and interpreting knowledge from other disciplines such as sociology, political science, psychology, philosophy and anthropology (Barrett-Herman, 2012). Teaching and learning about social work means acquiring the knowledge, values and skills for practice, as well as studying and learning disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge. Learning social work often commences with a course of study in a university or tertiary institution, and as Birkenmaier (2013) points out, 'practitioners must be trained while they are students to make the connections and be assisted in their justice-based practice' (p. 53). Being a social worker with a commitment to social

L. Watts and D. Hodgson, *Social Justice Theory and Practice for Social Work*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3621-8_11

justice is also a lifelong journey of learning, reflection and personal and professional development.

As mentioned in the preface in this book, one of the reasons that motivated us to write about social justice was for us to learn more about what social justice is, how we might do better at teaching it, and how to engage students into robust conversations and discussions about what social justice means, and how we might practice in a way that has social justice as a central concern. As educators, we are also interested in how social work curriculums might be structured or organised to better integrate and align theories, concepts and practices that promote critical engagement with social justice. This final chapter considers the education, curriculum and learning side of social justice thinking and understanding and we focus specifically on designing social work *curricula* with social justice in view. We have developed a focus on learning outcomes, and include a learning outcomes map for educators who may wish to adapt and integrate a specific focus on social justice to their curriculums and teaching (see Table 11.1).

There are many curriculum design systems. For our purposes, we have chosen three main approaches to develop and design a social justice curriculum. The first approach we have utilised in our thinking is the idea of *constructive alignment* (Biggs & Tang, 2007). The second approach incorporates the insights of constructive alignment with specific design steps and is called *backward design* (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). The third approach is Bloom's revised taxonomy of educational objectives (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Curriculum mapping and design have become an increasingly important form of research on social work education (Ballantyne, Beddoe, Hay, Maidment, & Walker, 2017; Watts & Hodgson, 2015). Curriculum design is also fundamental to the aim of internationalising the social work curriculum for the purposes of facing the significant economic, social and political challenges of globalisation (Healy & Link, 2012). We begin the discussion with constructive alignment.

Curriculum Frameworks

Constructive Alignment

Biggs (1996) suggests that there were two main currents with regard to designing curriculum—these are the objectivist and the constructivist traditions. Objectivist approaches see a separation between knowledge and learner whereas constructivist approaches see meaning as emerging from the interaction of the learner and their learning experiences. There are a number of other distinctions within the constructivist camp, however, we shall set these aside for this discussion. In social work, constructivist approaches to curriculum development and learning were taken up in the 1980s and remain a prevalent approach to social work education (Gray & Gibbons, 2002; Harrison, Walsh, & Healy, 2011). Constructive alignment combines this *constructivist approach* to learning with *alignment* between learning outcomes,

Table 11.1 A learning outcome map for social justice curricula

	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyse	Evaluate	Create
Factual	**Summarise** the definition of social justice in relevant social work codes of ethics (*for example, the relevant passage in the applicable social work code of ethics*) **Describe** what injustice is and its main forms with examples (*for example, inequality, poverty, racism, violence, discrimination, stigma*)	**Discuss** the history and role of social work ethics in orientating social work towards social justice (*for example, in codes of ethics and social work ethics literature*) **Explain** the different classifications of oppression and injustice including examples (*for example, violence, discrimination, exclusion*)	**Explain** what would be considered reliable and authoritative sources about social justice issues and responses (*for example, peer-reviewed literature, credible sources, good sources of information*) **Prepare** a general outline of social work's historical engagement with the pursuit of social justice (*for example, a comparison between early and modern social work, and international comparison of social work and work for social justice*)	**Categorise** the main ideas in each of the social work approaches to social justice (*for example, casework, group-work, visiting, community organising, policy and advocacy*) **Explain** in a non-reductive, empathic and explanatory way the systemic causes of injustice (*for example, the systemic and structural origins and causes of poverty and inequality*)	**Evaluate** the efficacy of social work ethics, standards and affiliations for their ability or otherwise to promote social justice (*for example, critique social work ethics and organised social work*) **Assess** empirical claims made for or against programs of social justice (*for example, critical thinking of knowledge—science, political and social discourses*)	**Develop** a vocabulary for transformative social relations for social justice (*for example, through dialogue, conscientisation, mutual attunement*) **Produce** knowledge and factual descriptions of injustice (*for example, research and data gathering, voiced/participatory/lived experience research, position papers, submissions*)

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyse	Evaluate	Create
Conceptual	**List** a range of philosophies or ethical theories concerned with social justice (*for example, distributive, critical, rights, empowerment, self-determination, ethics of care*) **Describe** practice situations or cases that present a social justice issue or problem (*for example, Indigenous struggles for reconciliation; people seeking asylum and refugees; stigma and discrimination in relation to mental illness and disability*)	**Describe** relevant theoretical and philosophical ideas about social justice (*for example, deontology, utilitarianism, distributive, rights, critical theories, and virtue ethics of care*) **Describe** relevant social work ethical principles and concepts in relation to social justice (*for example, empowerment, self-determination, emancipation, procedural fairness, natural justice*)	**Interpret** case material and apply relevant theoretical ideas that may promote social justice (*for example, cases of discrimination and stigma and a social work and social justice response*) **Review** novel cases of injustice and interpret them in relation to conceptual knowledge about social justice (*for example, new forms of exclusion; intersectionality; contemporary social justice crises due to conflict or policy changes; environmental issues*)	**Describe** a repertoire of behaviours and circumstances caused by forms of misrecognition, stigma, discrimination, violence and oppression (*for example, ill-health, anger, mental illness, trauma, suicidality, addiction, violence, apathy, alienation, silence*) **Trace** the bodies of knowledge that inform social work theories of social justice (*for example, critical, radical, structural, anti-oppressive theories*)	**Deconstruct** social, economic, political theories and philosophical bodies of knowledge (*for example, language, discourses, power, norms, culture and values in knowledge*) **Justify** and **critique** social work's role in advancing social justice (*for example, expose the gap between the ideal and realpolitik of social work*)	**Design** principles, classifications, theories and models for socially just social work practice (*for example, new approaches for social action on poverty or exclusion*) **Combine** existing bodies of social work knowledge with other knowledge to invent new approaches for addressing social injustice (*for example, from business, sustainability and philosophy to create new social work approaches towards social justice*)

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyse	Evaluate	Create
Procedural	**List** core social work skills or processes that promote social justice (*for example, empathic listening, respectful communication, advocacy, engagement, facilitation, group-work, community organising*) **Describe** the use of consent in practice (*for example, the process of asking for a service user consent for the use of and sharing of personal information*)	**Compare** macro/meso/micro level social work processes aimed at social justice (*for example, radical casework, policy advocacy, organisational development, group-work, listening and communication skills*) **Explain** how to use processes of natural justice, inclusion and participation in social work practice (*for example, routes of appeal in systems, service user involvement*)	**Practice** engagement skills that incorporate knowledge of the effects of stigma and discrimination (*for example, role play, field education, decolonising communication, empowerment and strengths-based communication, intercultural communication*) **Organise** resources effectively to ameliorate injustice (*for example, community organising, funding and project development, organisational development practice, networking and coalition building*)	**Compare** social work methods for their efficacy in addressing social justice (*for example, counselling/community work/casework/ advocacygroup-work/activism*) **Analyse** organisational and policy responses to a particular social justice issues (*for example, critical analysis of systems and policy responses*)	**Critique** social, economic and political arrangements and institutions that perpetuate injustice (*for example, neoliberalism, policy, state institutions, international institutions and agreements, dominant discourses*) **Critique** macro/meso/micro practices that perpetuate injustice, oppression and marginalisation (*for example, service criterion and rules, funding arrangements, laws, policies, language around service users*)	**Create** new technologies and methods of research, teaching and learning for social justice (*for example, combining deliberative democratic dialogical processes in field education, teaching non-violent resistance using improvisation, drama and arts*) **Create and test** new methods of communicating and relating in situations of deep diversity for social justice (*for example, teach mutual attunment processes* via *integration in class based group-work*)

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyse	Evaluate	Create
Metacognitive	**Describe** the role of self-awareness and values in social work (*for example, personal and professional values, core social work values in the literature and codes of ethics*) **State** the purpose of reflection for learning about social work and social justice (*for example, what is reflection and what role does it play in social work?*)	**Outline** learning strategies for acquiring factual, conceptual and procedural knowledge about social justice (*for example, reading and viewing, note-taking, create concept maps, discussion with peers, learning journal*) **Relate** learning strategies about social justice to own performance (*for example, reflect on self, peer and tutor feedback to improve performance*)	**Explain** own beliefs and values about social work responses to injustice (*for example, journal, personal narrative of origins of beliefs and values*) **Reflect** on own moral and philosophical beliefs about human nature and individual and social problems and how this shapes an identification to social work (*for example, reflection on social work and self-identity*)	**Analyse** the strengths and limits of methods used to acquire and integrate knowledge into one's own practice (*for example, field education, supervision, reflective practice*) **Develop** awareness of own biases in analysis and thinking (*for example, fallacies, dogma, confirmation bias, effects of emotion and experience*)	**Review** own choices of knowledge and methods for social justice practice (*for example, through supervision, reflection on practice, field education*) **Critically reflect** on the use of own power in social work practice (*for example, critical reflection, deconstruction of power using group-work or supervision models and processes*)	**Critically reflect** on own culture, ethics and beliefs for transformative practice development (*for example, lifelong learning, develop a critical reflection repertoire*) **Evaluate** own creativity and willingness to risk uncertainty in engaging with diverse others (*for example, engage in transformative practice*)

assessment and teaching and learning activities. Biggs (1996) uses a systems approach to curriculum development and this approach will make sense to social work as systems thinking is a theoretical perspective familiar from our work with service users. Here, the goal is to ensure that the learning outcomes, assessment and teaching and learning activities *align* with each other within a system, that is, within a curriculum (Biggs & Tang, 2007). This alignment may be applied at a number of levels. It can be applied to individual modules, or within whole programs. It may also be applied at the institutional level and for disciplines as a 'statement of what the graduates of the university [or discipline] are supposed to be able to do' (Biggs & Tang, 2007, p. 113). This articulation of purpose is important to social work in order to go beyond nation-state borders to develop a global response to issues of social justice. We turn now to consider backward design, which takes up the alignment process but does so with an explicit design focus. We think this is useful for addressing ways to achieve both breadth and depth of content and activity in social work education.

Backward Design

Backward design is a process that allows educators to start their curriculum design process from the position of results, and work backwards rather than focus on what content should be taught (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). What does it mean here to speak of results? These are the 'priority learnings' (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 17), which are ideas about what students should be able to understand and do after engaging in a learning experience or process. In this case, we considered the question of how we could design a whole curriculum in which *understanding* of social justice might take centre-stage. Wiggins and McTighe (2005, p. 17) suggest that this emphasis on understanding is a reversal of the usual curriculum design where the focus is on either establishing a slew of activities, or starting from the view of what should be covered, usually referred to as content. Activity-based curriculums are often characterised by lots of experience(s) without much integration of these with other forms of knowledge. Coverage refers to instances where 'students march through a textbook…in a valiant attempt to traverse all the factual material within a prescribed time' (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 16).

The other reason for adopting the backward design approach to curriculum design is that this approach increases the likelihood of coherence and integration across the curriculum. Coherence is important for professional socialisation and, by extension, the development of a commitment to social work purpose, values and identity. Tatto (1996, p. 176), speaking in the context of researching teacher education, contends that coherence develops from:

> shared understandings among faculty and in the manner in which opportunities to learn have been arranged (organizationally, logistically) to achieve a common goal - that of educating professional teachers with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to more effectively teach diverse students.

Despite originally being formulated for K-12 curriculum development, backward curriculum design processes embed the development of shared understanding within the design process and therefore it has good alignment with university curriculums with a student-centred focus (Linder, Cooper, McKenzie, Raesch, & Reeve, 2013). The process has three main steps: (1) identify desired results; (2) determine acceptable evidence; and, (3) plan learning experiences and instruction (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Step one involves faculty discussion about the goals, accreditation, practice standards and other factors (local and international) that are pertinent to designing a curriculum. The backward design process begins from the question of: 'what should students know, understand and be able to do? What content is worthy of understanding? And what *enduring* understandings are desired?' (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 17, emphasis original). It is in this step that designers set learning outcomes. This first step is also important to the consideration of alignment, both externally (for example, national tertiary and professional accreditation or registration and international practice standards) and internally (for example, vertical and horizontal subjects or modules within the program). This will depend on the focus of the design process.

Step two requires faculty to assess how they will be able to determine if students have achieved or acquired the understandings. This means thinking upfront about assessment as part of the process of design rather than as the last step. In this step, educators can consider the authenticity (Edmonds-Cady & Sosulski, 2012; Maclellan, 2004) and disciplinary appropriateness of assessment tasks (Tilbury, Osmond, & Scott, 2009). This is an important step as it facilitates shared understandings between faculty about assessment and the knowledge and skills thought to be essential. This does not preclude teaching diverse perspectives, rather, it places different methods of teaching and theories or perspectives within a shared framework.

Lastly, it is at step three that faculty create learning plans that incorporate activities and experiences, and it is here, finally, that they consider content (topics to be studied) and resources (for example, core readings, textbooks). It should be said that while this sounds like a linear process, in practice it is more subject to iterative cycles (Tornwall, 2017). The process can also be applied to single subject units or whole curriculums. For social workers familiar with action research, it is possible to see some parallels with backward design cycles of improvement if an added evaluation step is included. The core premise is to start with the end in mind, and this is how we have incorporated backward design thinking by asking: what kinds of understandings and applications of social justice ideas and principles are important for social work students to acquire? We turn now to consider the use of Bloom's revised taxonomy of learning as a way to scaffold learning about social justice nested within this framework of constructive alignment and backward design principles.

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of Learning

Bloom's taxonomy of learning, originally published in 1956, has had a major impact on the educational literature, particularly in regards to curriculum design and the development of authentic assessment methodologies (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). A taxonomy of learning is helpful to intentionally focus educators and student's attention and effort in a particular direction; in our example, to focus attention and effort to learning about social justice. Bloom's revised taxonomy assists in structuring curricula to scaffold learning in a sequential manner, from simple through to more complex higher order cognitive and knowledge dimensions. A learning outcome depicts the scope of what is intended and what is reasoned—that is, what is considered *valuable* and *important* (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Learning outcomes can then be used as platform to figure out how to design authentic assessment, to work out what resources and learning materials are needed, to map how the learning outcomes connect to other parts of the curricula or standards of social work education, and to put in place the mode of instruction that would best facilitate deep learning. Educators can use this form of scaffolding to consider the alignment of learning outcomes in a backward design process. In this section, we draw on Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) revision of Bloom's original taxonomy as a way of developing a map of learning outcomes. We restrict our discussion below to defining the central concepts in Bloom's revised taxonomy that are used to structure the learning outcomes as depicted in Table 11.1.

Concepts in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

The Knowledge Dimension

The authors of Bloom's revised taxonomy acknowledge there are many philosophical and psychological approaches to conceptualise knowledge, but in this particular case they have drawn on cognitive psychology (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This means the knowledge dimension outlined below is based on developments in problem-solving theory, as well as the development of expertise through experience. Thus, it fits well with a constructivist orientation and comfortably within the framework of constructive alignment. The premises of this taxonomy also fit comfortably with social work's orientation to knowledge as constructed, domain-specific and applied. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) acknowledge that there are a range of different terms for describing knowledge, but they have designated four types for use in the taxonomy. These are: '(1) factual knowledge; (2) conceptual knowledge; (3) procedural knowledge; and (4) metacognitive knowledge' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 41). We will outline here what each of these mean within this taxonomy.

First, a distinction between *factual* and *conceptual* needs explaining. Sometimes knowledge is distinguished between knowing that and knowing how. Within the

category of *knowing that*—sometimes called declarative knowledge—Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) introduce a distinction to address the way in which learners can acquire facts and discrete bits of information, but not necessarily attain connections about how such facts relate to each other, or indeed, how knowledge is organised as a whole within their discipline. Thus, conceptual knowledge picks up this second aspect, relating to the attainment of schemas, models and theories.

Factual knowledge is understood here as 'the basic elements that experts use in communicating about their academic discipline, understanding it, and organising it systematically' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 45). These are often isolated symbols and concepts that require little modification to be applicable. There are two subtypes important here: one is the 'knowledge of terminology', which is the language of the discipline and the other is 'knowledge of specific details and elements' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 45). An example of terminology in social work would be the language that describes violence and oppression in a way that other social workers recognise the subject matter being communicated. An example of specific details would be where educators ask social work students to find facts about social work responses to violence. Factual knowledge is considered to be the lowest level in terms of abstract knowledge.

Cognitive knowledge is more complex and refers to models, schemas, theories and concepts that indicate 'how a particular subject matter is organized and structured, how different parts or bits of information are interconnected and interrelated in a more systematic manner, and how these parts function together' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 48). As with factual knowledge this level includes three subtypes: *knowledge of classifications and categories; principles and generalisations;* and, *theories, models and structures.* Classifications and categorisations denote disciplinary approaches to dealing with information—each discipline engages in this as a way of developing knowledge and demonstrating expertise. Acquiring an understanding of a discipline-specific problem is a way for students to demonstrate learning. It might mean asking students to research social work ways of classifying forms of violence or oppression. Principles and generalisations are usually more abstract than classifying and categorising knowledge about distinct phenomena. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001, p. 51) suggest that 'abstractions…summarize observations of phenomena [and]…have the greatest value in describing, predicting, explaining, or determining the most appropriate and relevant action or direction to be taken.' For example, students might be asked to explain violence as a general pattern across a population, or alternatively they may be asked to explain the principles of non-violent action.

The final category here focuses on theories, models and structures and these are at the highest level of abstraction. This subtype is different from the previous two as it considers the interrelationships between principles and abstractions. For example, theories that explain violence as part of a gendered pattern of relating would be included here as it encompasses paradigms, theories and epistemological stances towards the subject matter. Students acquire these 'different paradigms and epistemologies for structuring inquiry, and …come to know these different ways

of conceptualizing and organizing subject matter and areas of research within the subject matter' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 52).

Procedural knowledge refers to knowledge within a discipline about how to do something. Knowledge here is about the sequence of doing, but it also includes criteria for choosing specific actions and procedures. The key distinction here from factual and conceptual knowledge is that those dimensions involve 'knowing that', whereas procedural knowledge involves 'knowing how'—a distinction made famous by Ryle (1963). Again, Anderson and Krathwohl (2001, pp. 53–55) have divided this category into subtypes: *subject-specific skills and algorithms; techniques and methods; and, criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures.* Skills and algorithms refers to 'series or sequence of steps, collectively known as a procedure' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 53). An example is communication skills for building rapport, which includes open and closed questions in addition to reflecting content and feelings (Cournoyer, 2013). Techniques and methods are those disciplinary ways of doing things that arise from practice and there is usually a considerable consensus about their efficacy. An example from social work is the helping process with the sequence of engagement-assessment-intervention-termination-review (Chenoweth & McAuliffe, 2015), or the process for establishing group norms for group work (McDermott, 2002). Lastly, criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures or processes is important to assist in making decisions about when to use a particular process. The differences between group-work aimed at community building versus that for addressing behaviour change in men who use violence in intimate relationships is used for determining appropriate procedures of group-work facilitation.

Metacognitive knowledge refers to learner's knowledge about their own thinking. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001, p. 55) state 'the labels for this…vary from theory to theory but include metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive awareness, self-awareness, self-reflection, and self-regulation'. The category has three subtypes: *strategic knowledge; knowledge of cognitive tasks, including contextual and conditional knowledge; and self-knowledge.* Strategic knowledge refers to the strategies for learning, thinking and solving problems and involves ways of rehearsing, elaborating and organising knowledge from the other knowledge dimensions in order to memorise it. An example might be students taking notes and devising concept maps (organising), recalling dates and maxims to commit them to memory (rehearsing), or summarising and paraphrasing key concepts and applying these to situations (elaborating).

Knowledge of cognitive tasks refers to students developing an understanding of what tasks call on them to expend in terms of cognitive resources. This is about the level of difficulty and knowledge of what tools would assist with completing different cognitive tasks for learning and development. For example, paraphrasing theoretical ideas developed by social workers about violence involves more effort than simply recalling dates for a test about the key events in social work history. Both tasks are more cognitively demanding than recognition tasks, which asks a 'person to discriminate among alternatives and select the correct or most appropriate answer' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 57). Self-knowledge refers to the knowledge learners acquire

about their own preferences for some learning strategies and approaches over others, as well as their own strengths and weaknesses as a learner. It is also the knowledge learners have about the limits and breadth of their own knowledge. It is not enough, however, to just know these limits and breadth—learners need to develop accuracy about it as well. Thus, students need to develop knowledge about what they do *not* know as much as what they do. Now that we have outlined the different knowledge types we turn now to describe the cognitive dimension of Bloom's revised taxonomy.

The Cognitive Dimension

The taxonomy has a cognitive dimension that is intended to provide a wider repertoire of cognitive processes from simple rote memorisation to more meaningful learning that has transferability (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This taxonomy includes *remember, understand, apply, analyse, evaluate* and *create*. As Anderson and Krathwohl state, remember, understand and apply are more commonly prescribed in curricula than analyse, evaluate and create. In social work, apply typically relates to the transfer of knowledge to practice, and evaluate is a higher order classification that would include critique. There is a general logic to how learning proceeds from simple to more complex cognitive tasks; for example, one must *remember* and *understand* something before engaging into an *evaluation* or *creative reconstruction* of it. A simple audit of social work curriculums in the form of mapping would reveal gaps both in cognitive focus but also whether or not there is coherence in terms of how learning is structured from one subject to the next, from one year to the next, and they way that threads of content are organised in the curriculum. The learning outcome map in Table 11.1 tries to move the learning focus both vertically (the knowledge dimension) and horizontally (the cognitive dimension). In simple terms, we can define the elements in the cognitive dimension as follows:

Remember refers to the retention and recall of material, which requires recognising and identifying the connections between new information and prior knowledge, and recalling and retrieving information from memory when prompted (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 66). For example, remembering specific concrete details about a piece of legislation and a procedure to do with mandatory reporting of child abuse and neglect. In this case, the student may identify connections between new details about the legislation and link that with their prior knowledge of child abuse, and they would be able to recall that information when required or prompted. This capability is essential for more complex cognitive tasks, such as an analysis and evaluation of the legislation.

Understand refers to the process of constructing meaningful connections between new knowledge and prior knowledge and experience. Understanding involves the act of: interpreting information; summarising information into themes or key points and explaining them; making inferences about abstract ideas, or finding relationships between them; and, comparing information, ideas and phenomena to locate their differences and similarities (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). For example, the act of

summarising a principle of natural justice, inferring from it how and where it might apply, comparing or relating it to other ethical principles (such as procedural fairness) to explore how they are alike or different, and then explaining this understanding in oral or written form.

Apply refers to the performative use of knowledge to solve problems, and execute or carry out tasks. As Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) state, when there is a known solution to a given problem, the use of knowledge is algorithmic following a set-down procedure. But for ill-structured problems where there is uncertainty, the cognitive task is to decide what knowledge is applicable, and why. In social work, this is often captured in the 'theory-to-practice' concept, and field placement is classically used for the application of knowledge to specific contexts and situations, many of them complex and ill-structured.

Analyse refers to 'breaking material into constituent parts and determining how the parts are related together and to an overall structure' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 79). Breaking material into parts involves being able to take a whole structure and differentiate its component parts (for example, to differentiate fact from opinion), organise pieces of information coherently (for example, to organise a relationship between a philosophical principle of social justice and a practice and skill of culturally respective communication), and make attributions (for example, to be able to deconstruct implicit and explicit assumptions or locate subtext, motives or ideological codes in information) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

Evaluate refers to making judgements about information, knowledge, situations or phenomenon using particular criterion (for example, does this meet ethical standards? Is this sufficient, or good enough?) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In social work, this is frequently captured in the terms *critique*, *critical* and *critically*. Evaluate uses processes of checking or testing for errors, fallacies, inconsistencies and weaknesses. Evaluation involves a critique, which is to make a judgement about the merits or value of something—for example, to judge something as ethical/not ethical, just/unjust, valid/invalid (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

Create refers to being able to draw on the other cognitive dimensions and learning and experience 'to form a coherent or functioning whole' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 84). This is a complex cognitive process that may combine elements of free expression with a synthesis of prior learning. In Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) schema, create involves the ability to generate new or different insights into something, which may include thinking that diverges from accepted rules or norms that structure knowledge and thought in fixed ways. Create also requires planning novel solutions to problems, and it includes the ability to carry out or implement the plan. In social work, this cognitive ability is actually very important to being able to devise novel plans and solutions to situations of complexity and diversity. It is a valuable antidote to practice that is increasingly a technical–rational activity that follows pre-structured bureaucratically driven rules and formulations.

Definitions for Learning Outcomes

So far, we have explained the concepts used in the vertical and horizontal axis of Bloom's revised taxonomy. This taxonomy is used to create learning outcomes that accord with the intersections of the horizontal and vertical axis (see Table 11.1). Learning outcomes should be prefaced with a directive word that indicates the verb action in the outcome. Given we have created 48 learning outcomes, we have defined the directive words for them in Box 11.1 and Box 11.2. The following directive words and their definitions in Box 11.1 are quoted directly from Marshall and Rowland (1993, p. 74).

Box 11.1 List of directive words from Marshall and Rowland (1993)

Analyse—show the essence of something by breaking it down into its component parts and examining each part in detail.
Compare—look for similarities and differences between propositions.
Critique—give your judgement about the merit of theories or opinions, about the truth of facts, and back your judgement by a discussion of the evidence.
Describe—give a detailed or graphic account of.
Discuss—investigate or examine by argument, sift and debate, giving reasons for and against.
Evaluate—make an appraisal of the worth of something, in the light of its apparent general truth or utility; including your own position.
Examine—present in depth and investigate the implications.
Explain—make plain, interpret, and account for in detail.
Interpret—bring out the meaning of and make clear and explicit; usually also giving your own judgement.
Justify—show adequate grounds for decisions and conclusions.
Outline—give the main features or general principles of a subject, omitting minor details, and emphasising structure and relationship.
Relate—narrate/show how things are connected to each other, and to what extent they are alike or affect each other.
Review—make a survey of, examining the subject critically.
Summarise—give a concise account of the chief points or substance of a matter, omitting details and examples.
Trace—identify and describe the development or history of a topic from some point of origin.

In addition to this selective list of directive words from Marshall and Rowland (1993), we have created our own directive words and definitions (see Box 11.2), largely to reflect both the applied nature of social work learning, but also more towards the 'metacognitive' and 'create' spectrums in Blooms revised taxonomy of learning.

In fact, Blooms argued that educators should adapt the taxonomy for their own disciplinary purposes (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), and so the following—along with the learning outcome map in Table 11.1—reflects a step towards that adaptation.

Box 11.2 Additional directive words for learning outcomes

Assess—judge phenomena, ideas, topics, concepts and practice for their applicability or relevance to a given context or purpose.
Categorise—classification of topics, ideas and concepts according to their similarity or like features.
Combine—unite different ideas, concepts, topics, and approaches into a new or novel whole.
Create—production of novel approaches through a process of invention or art.
Critically reflect—apply critical theory in the process of reflection.
Deconstruct—'to examine (something, such as a work of literature) using the methods of deconstruction; to take apart or examine (something) in order to reveal the basis or composition often with the intention of exposing biases, flaws, or inconsistencies' (Merriam-Webster, 2018).
Design—create plans for new approaches.
Develop—advance ideas, concepts and topics to a more elaborate level.
List—an arrangement of topics, concepts and key ideas.
Organise—arrange elements (topics, ideas, concepts, practices) in a coherent manner.
Practice—repeated application of behaviours, skills and ideas to achieve proficiency.
Prepare—make something that may be used for a specific purpose.
Produce—to bring an idea, concept, understanding, or approach into existence.
Reflect—returning to and considering an experience for the purpose of learning from it.
Test—determining through trial and error the applicability and worth of an idea or approach to given situations.

So far, we have explained the main design frameworks used to produce the learning outcomes map in Table 11.1, the format of which is adapted from Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). We have also explained the terminology and all the elements that constituted the basic structure of the learning outcomes and how they are organised. We should point out that we anticipate that educators could draw on this map to critically examine and focus their teaching, and adapt or interpret it into how they create their curriculums. We would expect a good deal of interpretation and reflexive adaptation of what we present, so that the adoption of social justice learning outcomes meets locally specific needs. For example, the learning outcomes in Table 11.1 each contain an illustrative example. These examples are to illustrate the central idea contained in the learning outcome and are not intended to be prescriptive.

		Mode of instruction	For example, student led; show and tell; explain; experiential; simulated; reflective; practicum.
		Resources	For example, required readings; texts; audio/video; samples; cases.
Cognitive and Knowledge dimensions in Bloom's revised taxonomy	**A single Learning Outcome**	**Telos**	The purpose or point to the learning outcome in regards to higher order values, ethics, principles or pedagogical goals.
		Curriculum alignment (internal)	How the learning outcome relates to other parts of the social work curriculum (internal and horizontal alignment) and how it functions as a scaffold towards higher level cognitive tasks, or other more complex forms of knowledge, values and skills.
		Curriculum alignment (external)	How the learning outcome relates to institutional standards or social work accreditation or practice standards.
		Mode of assessment and assurance	An assessment mode that promotes deep learning and logically relates to or aligns with the learning outcome.

Fig. 11.1 Conceptual model of learning outcome to teaching and learning processes

Students wishing to self-reflect on their learning can use the map to evaluate their learning and focus on social justice. There is one final caveat to the learning outcome map: when we were creating it we were mindful that there is so much more that could have been developed and included in the map, and so what is presented is not intended to be a final definitive account of a social justice oriented curriculum, but rather, an indication of the sorts of directions that a social work curriculum might travel towards a clear focus on social justice.

The learning outcomes presented in Table 11.1 require translation and development if they are to function as an effective curriculum. Using backward design principles, it logically follows that in order to attain the learning outcome there needs to be a mode of instruction, relevant resources, some point or purpose to the outcome, an alignment or connection to internal and external conditions (this is the point about constructive alignment) and an appropriate mode of assessment. Figure 11.1 depicts the relationship between a learning outcome and other elements in the teaching and learning process. Using backward design thinking, the steps move from learning outcomes through to other teaching processes, resources and internal and external alignments.

In Fig. 11.2 we have chosen to illustrate—by way of a worked example—how to apply the principles of constructive alignment and backward design to a single learning outcome from Table 11.1. We chose to focus the discussion on the knowledge dimension of *conceptual* and the cognitive process of *understanding*. The learning outcome in our example is: *Describe relevant theoretical and philosophical ideas about social justice*. The worked example in Fig. 11.2 reflects our Australian context of teaching in a Bachelor-level social work curriculum, but as before, we would anticipate that educators would adopt this general idea to their own purposes. The point of the worked example in Fig. 11.2 is to depict how to move from a single

		Mode of instruction	The mode of instruction may include a lecture or presentation of key concepts, background, and main theoretical and philosophical ideas. A case discussion or class debate in tutorial form will help with cognitive understanding.
		Resources	Key resources for this learning outcome: Banks (2006); Bowles et al (2006); Capeheart and Milanovic (2007); Fleishacker (2004); McAuliffe (2014).
Aspects from Bloom's revised taxonomy Conceptual (Knowledge) Understand (Cognitive process).	**Learning Outcome** Describe relevant theoretical and philosophical ideas about social justice.	**Telos**	The higher order pedagogical goals are: critical and conceptual thinking; reasoning skills; theoretical interpretation; historical and contextual knowledge; and, debate and argumentation skills.
		Curriculum alignment (internal)	This learning outcome has internal alignment with other aspects of social work curricula, such as: social work ethics; the theory and practice nexus; social work mission and purpose; legal concepts and knowledge; policy concepts and knowledge; knowledge from other disciplines (interdisciplinary perspective), and, a person-in-environment perspective. Alignment with other learning outcomes in Table 11.1 that moves from: remember/conceptual knowledge (list) → understand/conceptual knowledge (describe) → apply/conceptual knowledge (interpret) → evaluate/conceptual knowledge (deconstruct) → create/conceptual knowledge (design).
		Curriculum alignment (external)	This learning outcome has external alignment with social work ethics, practice standards, accreditation standards and tertiary education standards in the Australian higher education context, such as: International Federation of Social Work (2014) *Definition of Social Work*; Australian Association of Social Workers (2010) *Code of Ethics* social work values—specifically, respect for persons (s.3.1.), social justice (s.3.2), professional integrity (s.3.3), and commitment to social justice and human rights (s.5.1.3); Australian Association of Social Workers (2013) *Practice Standards*—specifically, values (p. 7), values and ethics (1.1a, p, 9), knowledge for practice (4.1a and 4.2b, p. 12); the Australian Qualifications Framework (2013) specifications for a Level 7 Bachelor degree to include broad and coherent theoretical knowledge, cognitive skills, judgement and autonomy in decision-making, and knowledge of theoretical principles (pp. 12-13, p. 16); and, Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (2012, v.1.4), specifically, knowledge of social work ethics (s.3.3.2) and knowledge from other disciplines (s.3.3.7).
		Mode of assessment and assurance	Assessment may include forms to deepen and evaluate cognitive understanding, such as (1) short answer questions summarising key ideas (2) a class symposium where groups present and discuss concept maps of how key ideas relate to social work (3) a topic essay.

Fig. 11.2 Worked example of learning outcome to teaching and learning processes

learning outcome to the practice of teaching and learning. If such a process were repeated for all 48 learning outcomes in Table 11.1, then we would have established a complete, logically sequenced and aligned curriculum focused on social justice learning.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have presented 48 learning outcomes that may serve as orientations for educating for social justice in social work education. We have also explained in detail the design frameworks, concepts and terminology that we used to produce the learning outcome map. As mentioned, we recognise that this will always be a work in progress. Social justice is a complex and essentially contested concept, and learning and thinking about social justice requires: engagement with multiple perspectives; attention to clarity in the concepts and ideas used; and, grounding in practical examples and in the aims, purposes and ethics of social work. To do this requires a willingness to enter into a continual discussion, dialogue and debate with others about what social justice means, why it is important, how we should think about it, and how we shall work for it. It has been our aim in this book to engage with this topic widely and present a rich account of social justice thinking, philosophy and theory for social work. We admit that this has been a challenging and daunting task, and one that by no means we feel is settled. However, we see that it is important for social work to reinvigorate a discussion about social justice, and to continue to make social justice a central point of orientation, meaning, and sustenance for social work practice.

References

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Australian Association of Social Work. (2012, v.1.4). *Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (ASWEAS)*. Canberra, Australian Capital Territory: Australian Association of Social Workers.

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2010). Code of ethics. Retrieved November 10, 2013, from http://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/1201.

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2013). Practice standards. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from http://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/4551.

Australian Qualifications Framework Council. (2013). Australian Qualifications Framework. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from https://www.aqf.edu.au/sites/aqf/files/aqf-2nd-edition-january-2013.pdf.

Ballantyne, N., Beddoe, L., Hay, K., Maidment, J., & Walker, S. (2017). Social work education, curriculum mapping and education taxonomies (pp. 1–29). Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence, University of Canterbury Te Whare Wananga o Waitaha, Open Polytechnic Kuratini Tuwhera, Massey University Te Kunenga Ki Purehuroa, University of Otago Te Whare Wananga o Otago, The University of Auckland Te Whare Wananga o Tamaki Makaurau.

Banks, S. (2006). *Ethics and values in social work* (3rd ed.). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barrett-Herman, A. (2012). Comparative cross-national research (World Census). In L. M. Healy & R. J. Link (Eds.), *Handbook of international social work: Human rights, development, and the global profession* (pp. 357–362). New York: Oxford University Press.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 347–364.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (3rd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Birkenmaier, J. (2013). On becoming a social justice practitioner. In E. Burkemper, W. J. Hutchinson, J. Wilson, & J. J. Stretch (Eds.), *Practicing social justice* (pp. 41–54). New York, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
Bowles, W., Collingridge, M., Curry, S., & Valentine, B. (2006). *Ethical practice in social work: An applied approach*. Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
Capeheart, L., & Milovanovic, D. (2007). *Social justice: Theories, issues, and movements*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, London: Rutgers University Press.
Chenoweth, L., & McAuliffe, D. (2015). *The road to social work and human service practice* (4th ed.). London, UK: Cengage.
Cournoyer, B. (2013). *The social work skills workbook* (7th ed.). California: Cengage Learning.
Edmonds-Cady, C., & Sosulski, M. R. (2012). Applications of situated learning to foster communities of practice. *Journal of Social Work Education, 48*(1), 45–64.
Fleischacker, S. (2004). *A short history of distributive justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press.
Gray, M., & Gibbons, J. (2002). Experience based learning and its relevance to social work practice. *Australian Social Work, 55*(4), 279–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/03124070208410986.
Harrison, G., Walsh, D., & Healy, K. (2011). Shifting the focus from expert-centred to student-centred learning resources: Creating student-centred learning resources for direct practice. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education, 13*(1), 91–110.
Healy, L. M. (2012). Defining international social work. In L. M. Healy & R. J. Link (Eds.), *Handbook of international social work: Human rights, development, and the global profession* (pp. 9–15). New York, US: Oxford University Press.
Healy, L. M., & Link, R. J. (2012). Models of internationalizing curriculum. In L. M. Healy & R. J. Link (Eds.), *Handbook of international social work: Human rights, development, and the global profession* (pp. 329–337). New York, US: Oxford University Press.
International Federation of Social Workers. (2014). Global definition of social work. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from http://ifsw.org/policies/definition-of-social-work/.
Linder, K. E., Cooper, F. R., McKenzie, E. M., Raesch, M., & Reeve, P. A. (2013). Intentional teaching, intentional scholarship: Applying backward design principles in a faculty writing group. *Innovative Higher Education, 39*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-013-9273-0.
Maclellan, E. (2004). Authenticity in assessment tasks: A heuristic exploration of academics' perceptions. *Higher Education Research & Development, 23*(1), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436032000168478.
Marshall, L. A., & Rowland, F. (1993). A guide to learning independently (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
McAuliffe, D. (2014). *Interprofessional ethics: Collaboration in the social, health and human services*. Port Melbourne, Victoria: Cambridge University Press.
McDermott, F. (2002). *Inside group work: A guide to reflective practice*. Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
Ryle, G. (1963). *The concept of mind*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
Tatto, M. T. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students: Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(2), 155–180. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164554.
Tilbury, C., Osmond, J., & Scott, T. (2009). Teaching critical thinking in social work education: A literature review. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education, 11*(1), 31–50.
Tornwall, J. (2017). Backward design toward a meaningful legacy. *Nurse Education Today, 56,* 13–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.05.018.

Watts, L., & Hodgson, D. (2015). Whole curriculum mapping of assessment: Cartographies of assessment and learning. *Social Work Education, 34*(6), 682–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2015.1048217.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design (expanded)*. Alexandria, US: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.