

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
BSSW Program**

SW 416 – Social Welfare Policy and Issues

FALL 2009 (3 credit hours)

Instructor: Dr. Stan L. Bowie, Assoc Professor	Office Hours: Thursday, 11:35 -1:30
Office: 326 Henson Hall	Fax: (865) 974-3701
Phone: (865) 974-0692	Class time: Tues/Thurs, 9:40 - 10:55 AM
E-mail: sbowie@utk.edu	209 Henson Hall

Program Mission:

The BSSW program at the University of Tennessee exists to fulfill a need for disciplined, highly educated and trained generalist social workers to help people improve their social functioning in a technologically complex, culturally diverse, and rapidly changing world without borders. There is a focus on the reciprocal relationships between persons and their environments. Social workers are doers; they are problem-solvers who are able to intervene in multiple-level systems and perform various professional roles. Their actions are guided and informed by a broad knowledge-base, code of ethics, and professional values. Social workers are educated and trained to do things right as well as to do the right thing.

The mission of the BSSW program is to develop generalist social workers who are strategic thinkers, life-long learners and opinion shapers. The knowledge-base, skills, and values necessary for generalist practice are taught in an environment that fosters professional development, critical thinking, and leadership and prepares students to take appropriate action guided by the best available scientific evidence. We are dedicated to preparing practitioners for the challenges of today's complex pluralistic world. Since the amount of knowledge doubles approximately every five years, what is taught today may soon be obsolete. Our challenge, therefore, lies in the on-going development and implementation of a curriculum that prepares and energizes students for generalist practice today and in the future.

Program Goals:

Provision of education and training that enable students to become generalist social work practitioners who:

1. are committed to advancing social and economic justice and the principles, values, and ethics that guide the social work profession;
2. are committed to evidence-based practice;
3. are grounded in systems theory and operate within a person-in-the-environment framework;
4. use the problem-solving process to intervene in multiple-level client systems;
5. have an understanding of human diversity, special populations, and domestic and international challenges, that informs practice interventions;
6. use critical thinking, evaluative skills, and leadership skills to address the needs of a complex, changing global world; and
7. are committed to continuous development of professional self.

Catalogue Description:

Policy formation processes, policymakers in systems, and policy-related role expectations. Emphasis on utilizing and analytical framework and social change efforts. *Progression or consent of*

instructor required.

Extended Description:

In this course we will emphasize a major function of social work practice, “contribution to the development and modification of social policy.” Policy -- be it made by legislative bodies (federal, state, local), executives or government, judicial decisions, public administrative agencies, professional associations, directors and practitioners in social resource systems, or consumer groups, has a profound impact on practice in terms of what and how much is available, who the recipients are, and the delivery of social welfare services. As front-line workers, baccalaureate social workers are in a position to encounter dysfunctional policies, to call attention to these problems, to assist those who are in a position to facilitate change, and to formulate policy which is congruent with the mission of the profession. Social welfare policy is a vital concern and a critical part of practice, and if ignored, decisions which impact practice and the social well-being of others can be rendered by those who are ill-informed.

The course assignments, readings, and discussion content will routinely and deliberately place special emphasis on diversity issues in social work and social welfare, populations-at-risk, social and economic justice, and leadership development by social work students and social work practitioners.

Course Objectives:

The objectives of this course are to provide the student opportunities and the environment to understand and analyze:

1. that policy emerges from the influence of values, knowledge and experience;
2. the importance and the relationship of social welfare policy to social work practice;
3. the knowledge and skills necessary to influence, formulate, and evaluate policies that concern generalist social workers;
4. action strategies regarding policies that deny equal treatment and social equity to those assigned to minority status;
5. the importance of utilizing research findings and documentation in proposing policy implementation and reform.

Course Competencies:

By the completion of this course, students are expected to be able to demonstrate the following (through course activities, assignments, and/or exams):

1. Define and discuss social welfare policy, who formulates social welfare policy and why, where social welfare policy is developed, how it is implemented, and how it is evaluated;
2. Discuss the relationship between social welfare policy and baccalaureate social work practice;
3. Identify major systems of resources utilized in generalist practice and specific policies that guide these resources;
4. Discuss stages of policy formulation and identify points of intervention for generalist practitioners;
5. Identify sources of knowledge regarding policies developed in various resource systems;
6. Articulate gaps and/or problems in existing social welfare policies and in social welfare programs;
7. Identify and utilize a framework for policy analysis, as well as actively participate in the policy formulation process;

8. Delineate strategies which are appropriate to baccalaureate level practice that may influence policymakers on behalf of people in need;
9. Articulate the critical elements and issues regarding a specific social welfare or public policy, aggressively research all aspects of the policy, determine its strengths and weaknesses, and defend the policy in a structured, public speaking and debate forum.

INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS:

- Demonstrated growth, development, and maturation in critical thinking capacity as it relates to social work practice, social welfare policy, and current national and international events related to social welfare policy;
- Demonstrated ability to effectively work in teams to complete a sophisticated and challenging policy analysis group project in a timely manner;
- Demonstrated ability to prepare for and actively engage in high-level, structured discussions and debate regarding past and current social welfare policies and their impact on the public-at-large.

Required Textbooks:

American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Note: The textbook and reserve reading content will be supplemented to a significant degree with Power Point class presentations by the instructor. The Power Point slides will include content from assigned reading, as well as current scholarly literature and research on social welfare policy. The Power Point slides will be provided to the class electronically and students are responsible for knowing the information.

Recommended Readings:

- Barusch, A.S. (2009). *Foundations of social policy: Social justice in human perspective* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Bowie, S.L. (2009). Undergraduate social welfare policy debates: An assessment of outcomes using the Policy Debate Rating Scale. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*, 14(1), 63-82.
- Bowie, S.L., Dias-Bowie, Y., Fields, B., & Bryant, S.D. (2009). Intimacy in poverty's midst: Marriage, intimate male relationships, and TANF-reliant African American women. *Families in Society*, 90(3), 1-7.
- Bowie, S. L. (2004). Privatized management in urban public housing communities: A comparative analysis of social service availability, utilization, and satisfaction with services. *Social Work*, 49(4), 562-571.
- Bowie, S., Stepick, C.D., & Stepick, A. (2000). Voices from the welfare vortex: A descriptive profile of urban, low-income African American women on the eve of devolution. In L.G. Nackerud, & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Early implications of welfare reform in the southeast* (91-111). Hunting, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Bowie, S.L., & Stepick, A. (1998). Diversity and division: Ethnicity and the history of Miami. In F.W. Becker, & M.J. Dluhy (Eds.), *Research in urban policy: Solving urban problems in urban areas characterized by fragmentation and divisiveness* (pp. 19-32). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Diller, J.V. (1999). *Cultural diversity: A primer for the human services*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Jansson, B.S. (2005). *The reluctant welfare state: American social welfare policies—past, present, and future*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

McInnis-Dittrich, K. (1994). *Integrating social welfare policy & social work practice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Rae, A., & Nicholas-Wolosuk, W. (2003). Social work, social change, and policy practice in the agency and community. In *Changing agency policy: An incremental approach* (pp. 1-22). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Class requirements, Assignments, and Grading:

The final grade in the class will be based upon the following criterion and their corresponding grade percentages:

<u>Event(s)</u>	<u>% of Grade</u>	<u>Date/Due</u>
Midterm Examination	25%	October 13 (T)
Group Policy Analysis Term Paper	25%	October 29 (Thu)
Group Policy Debate	25%	November 3,5,10,12,17,19
Policy Debate E-Critiques	10%	November 5,7,12,14,19,21
Peer Review Evaluation	<u>15%</u>	December 2 (T)
Total = 100%		

Policy Debate Dates and E-Critique Deadlines:

<u>Debate Date</u>	<u>E-Critique Due Date (5:00 PM)</u>
• Nov 3	Nov 5
• Nov 5	Nov 7
• Nov 10	Nov 12
• Nov 12	Nov 14
• Nov 17	Nov 19
• Nov 1	Nov 21

Disability Services:

If any student needs course adaptations or accommodations because of a documented disability, or if you have emergency information to share, please contact the Office of Disability Services at 2227 Dunford Hall, 974-6087. This will ensure that you are properly registered for services.

Attendance Policy:

Absences and tardiness are not permitted in this class. The consequences of more than three (3) absences may be the final course grade being lowered one letter grade. Emergencies, illness, accidents and inclement weather do occur. You may need to be late or be absent sometime during the semester. This policy allows three absences for such events before your final grade is lowered.

Major Course Assignments and Examination:**Assignment #1: Policy Analysis and Intervention Group Term Paper (25% of Grade)******[Course competencies addressed: 1,4,5,6,7]**

Class groups are required to select and evaluate a specific social policy (proposed or existing) involving the needs of a specific vulnerable client population. The policy topic will be assigned by the professor. The policy analysis will be done in accordance with the ANALYSIS model in the McGinnis-Dittrich (1994). The ANALYSIS model will be presented and discussed thoroughly in class.

Each group will also develop a policy-related intervention plan and provide an agenda for implementing the plan. Guidelines will be provided for doing this in accordance with the problem-solving approach, which will also be discussed in detail. The plan must also **clearly address identified gaps in the existing social policy, anticipated obstacles** to the proposed intervention, and an evaluation strategy.

Policy analysis papers are also required to include content on diversity and multi-culturalism issues. In other words, how is the policy you are writing about related to, or how might it affect the various “outgroups” discussed in class?

Each group will collaborate and prepare a written report (term paper) not to exceed 40 typed and double-spaced pages. The paper must be written strictly by APA VI guidelines and must include appropriate citations and references. **The term paper is due on Thursday, October 29, 2009.**

Individual student grades will be given for both the debates and the term papers. *This means that each individual will be graded for his/her work alone, but they will also be graded on the extent that their section of the paper flows well and logically fits with the other sections.*

Each group will be required to maintain a detailed log of group meetings, attendance, and indicate what tasks were completed by whom, including which group members wrote specific sections of the term paper. The instructor will hold 1-2 meetings with each group to assure adequate progress on the group assignment.

Assignment #2: Social Welfare Policy Debate (25% of Grade)****[Course competencies addressed: 1,2,3,5,6,8,9]**

Social welfare policies are debated at every level of the U.S. government system. In order to facilitate the critical thinking process and to help understand the dynamics of that process, ***each student will participate in a social welfare policy debate regarding specific (and controversial) topics of concern to social workers.*** This exercise will provide students with (1) an understanding of the policy-making process; (2) the opportunity to “debate the issues” relevant to them and the social work profession; (3) a forum to research, analyze, and evaluate specific policies through a group process; and (4) a public speaking event.

<u>Policy Debate Schedule</u>	<u>Team</u>	<u>Policy Debate Date</u>
Debate #1	Alpha Debate Team	November 3 rd (Tue), UC Shiloh Room
Debate #2	Beta Debate Team	November 5 th (Thu), UC Crest Room
Debate #3	Delta Debate Team	November 10 th (Tue), UC Shiloh Room
Debate #4	Epsilon Debate Team	November 12 th (Thu), UC Shiloh Room
Debate #5	Gamma Debate Team	November 17 th (Tue), UC Shiloh Room
Debate #6	Kappa Debate Team	November 19 th (Thu), UC Shiloh Room

Policy Debate Format

The debate format used in this exercise is the most widespread form of debate. The debate issues or topics are policy-oriented (for example: “All people who receive welfare benefits should undergo mandatory drug testing.”) Three to four students will take an affirmative position on the topic area (“pro”) and two to three students will take an opposition position (“con”).

Note: The policy debate teams and topics will be assigned by the professor.

Each team will be required to take a firm stand on the issue, explain the logic of their position, use quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (personal or telephonic interviews with experts) data to support their arguments, and help the audience understand why their idea is more reasonable than that of the opponent (s). There is a strict format for the debates that includes specific time limits for presentation of affirmative and negative positions, cross-examinations by opponents, rebuttals, and closing arguments. The audience will also have an opportunity to ask questions, provide written comments to each debate team, and vote their preferences on which team presented the best arguments.

The professor recognizes that some students will be forced to take a position that they do not personally agree with. This is, however, a realistic aspect of social policy dynamics and will provide a valuable perspective on the political complexity of the policy-making process, as well as the role of personal and/or societal values. It will also help to elucidate the ideas of stakeholders, balance of power, out groups, oppression, and environmental influences on social policy.

The debates will be 60 minutes in length, with another 10 minutes allotted for class inquiries and discussion. All debate team members must equally participate in the debate. Any debate team member that does not have equal participation in the debate will receive an individual grade reduction. During the “heat of the debate,” it is sometimes difficult and/or uncomfortable getting a chance to respond to comments from the opposing team. It is the responsibility of each debate team member to assert themselves and be actively involved, even if you have to occasionally interrupt speakers to do so. The specific times allotted for each part of the debate will be as follows:

Affirmative Position Statement/Opening argument	10 minutes
Opposition Position Statement/Opening Argument	10 minutes
Opposition Cross-Examination	10 minutes
Affirmative Cross-Examination	10 minutes
Closing Affirmative Arguments	10 minutes

Closing Opposition Arguments	10 minutes
Audience Questions	10 minutes

Total Debate Time = 70 minutes

IMPORTANT: All debate team members are required to take equal part in either the opening or closing Statements, as well as the cross-examinations.

Written Policy Debate Outline

Debate teams are required to prepare a written debate outline and submit it to the professor ***one week prior to the scheduled debate***. The outline must include the following information:

- (1) A clear statement of what your debate objectives are;
- (2) an outline of your strategy for achieving those objectives, including a summary of information to be presented, questions to be used in the cross-examination, etc. (this should be in numbered or “bullet” format);
- (3) Definitions of key terms that may have a bearing on your topic (do not assume that the audience is familiar with “specialized” terminology); and
- (4) A reference list for all documents and/or scholarly literature used for the debates (See APA VI). A minimum of two interviews are required with individuals who are knowledgeable about your topic and who can serve as a “legitimate authority” on your topic of interest. These interviews should be referenced in “personal communication” format (See APA VI).

Policy Debate “E-Critiques:” (10% of grade)

All students are required to conduct “e-critiques” of each of the policy debate teams. Critique forms will be provided to students at the beginning of each debate to facilitate the process. E-critiques will be electronically aggregated and forwarded to the respective debate teams through BlackBoard. This process will ensure anonymity of the raters. The E-critiques will rate debate teams on organization, effectiveness, strength of evidence, and quality/effectiveness of opening/closing statements and cross examinations.

Other Policy Debate Specifications:

Diversity and Multi-culturalism Content Requirement

Policy debates are required to include and address content on diversity and multi-culturalism issues related to their topic. For example, how is the debate topic related to, or how might it affect one or more of the ethnic or racial “outgroups” discussed in class? This issue must be addressed in a substantive manner during the debate.

Comparative Perspectives

Comparative and international perspectives are salient in relation to social welfare policy. Both debate teams must incorporate the experiences of another country and another state

(other than Tennessee) with respect to the selected policy issue. This should be examined in the context of, “what can be learned about this issue from previous experiences of another country or another state in the U.S.?” That information should be used to buttress the affirmative or opposition debate positions on the matter.

Policy Debate “Set-Up” Teams

The physical set-up for the policy debates is a vital aspect of the overall experience. It is important, therefore, that the preparation for the 5 consecutive weeks of debates be as efficient as possible. The six (6) debate teams will be responsible for the physical set-up and logistical implementation of at least one debate by another team. The rule is simple: the team that participates in their scheduled debate is responsible for set-up and management of the following debate. Example: When the Beta Team (#2) debates on November 5, the Alpha Team (#1) will be the set-up crew. The following week (November 10), the Beta Team will manage the set-up for the Delta Team.

Set-up areas of responsibility include the following:

- Clock management
- Videotaping
- Shiloh Room logistics (e.g., microphone, extension cords, etc.)
- Debate protocol
- Question/Answer facilitation
- Dissemination of written class critiques

Set-up teams are responsible for all aspects of managing the debate, and for making sure all equipment is operational, dismantled upon completion of debates, and returned to the instructor’s office. Set-up team members will sign up for the different areas of responsibility and the instructor will be given a copy of the sign-up sheet in advance. Set-up teams must have the room “debate ready” by 9:30 AM, so the debate can begin promptly at 9:45 AM.

Midterm Examination (25% of Grade)

****[Course competencies addressed: 1,3,4,6,8]**

In addition to the social policy debate and group term paper, **there will be a midterm examination on Tuesday, October 13, 2009.** The examination will consist of materials from assigned readings and from material presented and discussed in class, as well as additional material that may be assigned by the professor. Specifically, the midterm examination will cover readings, class discussions, and other assignments related to the following competencies: (1) definition and discussion of social welfare policy, who formulates social welfare policy and why, where social welfare policy is developed, how it is implemented, and how it is evaluated; (2) discussion of the relationship between social welfare policy and baccalaureate social work practice; (3) Identification of major systems of resources utilized in generalist practice and specific policies that guide these resources; (4) discussion of stages of policy formulation and identification of points of intervention for generalist practitioners; and (7) Identification and application of a framework for policy analysis. Students are strongly urged to keep up with assigned readings to avoid getting too far behind and creating unnecessary stress. All reading assignments indicated for a particular date should be read before the class in which it will be discussed.

Peer Review Evaluation (15% of final Grade)

The BSSW Program goals include a deliberate process of developing “generalist social work practitioners who...are committed to continuous [personal] development of professional self.” With that goal in mind, all team members will be accountable to their peers in terms of handling their tasks, duties, and responsibilities related to the Policy Analysis and Policy Debate projects. At the end of the semester, each team member will conduct an anonymous Peer Review Evaluation Rating of their other team members that addresses the following:

- Extent of participation at group meetings, including attendance and punctuality;
- Extent of active involvement in planning and completing Policy Analysis Group Term Paper;
- Extent of active involvement in planning and preparing for the Policy Debates, and
- Extent that member handled overall responsibilities (i.e., “carried their weight”) with both the Policy Analysis Term Paper and Policy Debates in a responsible and productive manner.

Assignment/Exam “Make-Up” Policy

If an assignment is not completed by the deadline date, or an examination is missed, the grade will be recorded as a “0” grade (no points). Make up examinations or assignment extensions will only be given in cases of verifiable emergencies. If there are extenuating circumstances, the instructor must be notified prior to the date of an examination or the due date of an assignment. Be prepared to verify any emergency in writing, and possibly back-up verification, if requested.

Grading Scale:

A	100-90	C	74-70
B+	89-85	D	69-60
B	84-80	F	59- Below
C+	79-75		

Grading Scale:

100-90	A	Outstanding/superior—exceptional performance. Consistently met expectations.
89 -85	B+	Very good—student consistently met and occasionally exceeded normal expectations for the course.
84 -80	B	Good—student consistently met normal expectations for the course.
79 -75	C+	High average—there was unevenness in grasping course content. Student was Inconsistent, but met expectations for the course.
74 -70	C	Average—there was a lack of understanding of course content and/or effort. Student met course expectations.
69 -60	D	Below average. Student had erratic attendance, unacceptable work with assignment groups, and poor performance on exams and/or other class assignments. Barely met course requirements.
59 -0	F	Minimum course requirements were not met

Honor Statement:

The University of Tennessee is proud of its students' commitment to academic integrity and their pledge to abide by the Honor Statement found in *Hilltopics*: "As a student of the University, I pledge that I will neither knowingly give nor receive any inappropriate assistance in academic work, thus affirming my personal commitment to honor and integrity." This tradition of intellectual honesty is maintained by the cooperation of students and faculty members. According to *Hilltopics*, "each faculty member is responsible for defining, in specific terms, guidelines for preserving academic integrity in a course." I shall discuss the important Honor Statement, as it relates to both individuals and groups in this particular course, at either the first or second class meeting.

Extra Credit:

It is the BSSW program's expectation that all social work majors participate in the BSSW Student Social Work Organization (BSSW-SWO) or the National Association of Black Social Workers Organization (NABSW). All students, regardless of major, who are enrolled in a social work course or considering a major in social work are welcome. BSSW-SWO meets every Tuesday from 11:10 - 12:25 in room 209, Henson Hall. This time slot is built into the class schedule as a lab for many social work courses. Given the time of the meetings, students are encouraged to bring their lunch.

The BSSW-SWO and NABSW are student organizations that provide an excellent opportunity for leadership development, community and university service, the enhancement of group skills, research opportunities, and socialization. The organization and its activities are viewed as an extension of the BSSW curriculum. **Students in this class will have the opportunity to earn 3-5 points added to their final course grade by attending and participating in the BSSW-SWO or NABSW this semester.** Your attendance and participation must be documented. Attendance will be taken at each meeting. To be an active member in BSSW-SWO and be eligible for extra credit, students are required to attend at least 7 meetings per semester (officers are required to attend 75% of the meetings each semester) and earn between 3 and 5 participation points. Participation points are earned using the following scale:

- 1 point for attending minimum number of meetings required for membership (see above);
- 1 point for participating in one or more drives;
- 2 points for fundraising participation;
- 2 points for community service or other participation

Criteria for participation in all activities is determined by BSSW-SWO faculty advisor and committee chairs. Students may earn 3 to 5 extra credit points in designated BSSW courses. Points awarded for extra credit equal BSSWO-SWO participation points for a minimum of 3 and not to exceed 5 points. No points will be awarded for students earning less than 3 participation points. **No other extra credit is available in this class.**

SEMESTER TIMETABLE**WEEK #****MAJOR DISCUSSION TOPICS**

#1, Aug 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Student/Instructor Introductions – Overview of program goals, course, required assignments, question/answer/clarification – Debate group assignments
------------	--

- #2, Aug 25
Aug 27
- Social welfare policy social problems
 - Social work and social justice
 - Outgroups, deficit/non-deficit perspectives, and social welfare policy
 - The policy formulation process.
 - Contextual factors in social welfare policy
 - Moral dilemmas in social welfare policy
 - Policy in the news

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

- #3, Sept 1
Sept 3
- ***** Continuation of Content from Week # 2 *******
- Debate prep
 - Policy in the news

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

- #4, Sept 8
Sept 10
- Historical perspectives on social welfare policy
 - Feminist perspectives and social welfare policy
 - Policy practice and advocacy
 - Policy practice skills
 - Ideology, policy, and the American political arena
 - Debate prep
 - Policy in the news

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

- #5, Sept 15
Sept 17
- Critical thinking and empirical policy research
 - The continuum from policy to program implementation
 - Socioeconomic structure and social welfare policy
 - Debate prep
 - Policy in the news

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

- #6, Sept 22
Sept 24
- Ethical issues in social welfare policy
 - Policy analysis and problem-solving models

- Diversity, multi-culturalism, and social welfare policy
- **U.S. Policy Review:**
 - *Economic security*
 - *Food and nutrition*
 - *Family preservation/ child welfare*

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

#7, Sept 29
Oct 1

- **U.S. Policy Review:**
 - *Housing and homelessness*
 - *Mental health and substance abuse*
 - *Physical illness and disability*
 - *Elderly Americans*
 - *Health care*
- Debate prep
- Policy in the news

Reading Assignment:
Assigned Weekly PowerPoint Slides

#8, Oct 6
Oct 8

- **U.S. Policy Review:**
 - *Social insurance*
 - *GBLT issues*
 - *Working Americans*

****** No class on Thursday ---- Fall Break ******

#9, Oct 13
Oct 15

- ***** Tuesday – Midterm Examination *****
– Thursday -- Debate/Policy Analysis Prep Day (Mandatory)

#10, Oct 20
Oct 22

- *U.S. Policy Review:*
 - *Women and children*
 - *Low income energy assistance*
 - *Earned income tax credit*
 - *Criminal justice*

- *Managed care*
- *Social work and religion*
- *Privatization*

- #11, Oct 27 – Classroom viewing of full debate
 Oct 29 – Thursday -- Debate/Policy Analysis Prep Day (Mandatory)

***** Policy analysis Papers due today, Thu, Oct 29th *****

- #12, Nov 3 – **Policy Debate #1: Alpha Team**
 Nov 5 Setup Team: Kappa
- **Policy Debate #2: Beta Team**
Setup Team: Alpha

- #13, Nov 10 – **Policy Debate #3: Delta Team**
 Nov 12 Setup Team: Beta
- **Policy Debate #4: Epsilon Team**
Setup Team: Delta

- #14, Nov 17 – **Policy Debate #5: Gamma Team**
 Nov 19 Setup Team: Epsilon
- **Policy Debate #6: Kappa Team**
Setup Team: Alpha

- #15, Nov 24 – Policy Debate Debriefing and Recapitulation
 – Future Social Welfare Policy Challenges and the Role of Social Workers
- Nov 26 – ***** Thanksgiving Holiday – No Class *****

- #16, Dec 1 – Final Class. Wrap-up and course evaluation.
 – ***** Peer Evaluations Due Today (Mandatory) *****

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Anderson, J., & Carter, R.W. (Eds.)(2003). *Diversity perspectives for social work practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Axinn, J., & Stern, M.J. (2005). *Social welfare: A history of the American response to need* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barusch, A.S. (2009). *Foundations of social policy: Social justice in human perspective* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Bowie, S.L. (2009). Undergraduate social welfare policy debates: An assessment of outcomes using the Policy Debate Rating Scale. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*, 14(1), 63-82.
- Bowie, S.L., Dias-Bowie, Y., Fields, B., & Bryant, S.D. (2009). *Intimacy in poverty's midst: Marriage, intimate male relationships, and TANF-reliant African American women*. *Families in Society*, 90(3), 1-7.
- Bowie, S.L. (2004). Navigating the concrete jungle: African American children and adolescents in urban public housing developments. In Dulmus, C.D., & Sowers, K.M. (Eds.), *How institutions are shaping the future of our children: For better or for worse?* New York: Haworth.
- Bowie, S., Stepick, C.D., & Stepick, A. (2000). Voices from the welfare vortex: A descriptive profile of urban, low-income African American women on the eve of devolution. In L.G. Nackerud, & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Early implications of welfare reform in the southeast* (91-111). Hunting, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Bowie, S.L., & Stepick, A. (1998). Diversity and division: Ethnicity and the history of Miami. In F.W. Becker, & M.J. Dluhy (Eds.), *Research in urban policy: Solving urban problems in urban areas characterized by fragmentation and divisiveness* (pp. 19-32). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Briggs, H.E., & Rzepnicki (Eds.)(2004). *Using evidence in social work practice: Behavioral perspectives*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Brewster, L.G., & Stowers, G.N.L. (2004). *The public agenda: Issues in American politics* (5th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Chambers, D.E., & Wedel, K.R. (2005). *Social policy and Social programs: A method for the practical public policy analyst* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chapin, R. (2007). *Social policy for effective practice: A strengths approach*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Cherry, R. (2007). *Welfare transformed: Universalizing family policies that work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, S.R., & Meier, S.T. (2001). *The elements of managed care: A guide for helping professionals*.
- Day, P.J. (2006). *A new history of social welfare* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Diller, J.V. (1999). *Cultural diversity: A primer for the human services*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- DiNitto, D.M. (2005). *Social welfare: Politics and public policy* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dolgoff, R., & Feldstein, D. (2009). *Understanding social welfare: A search for social justice* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dulmus, C.N., & Sowers, K.M. (Eds.)(2004). *How institutions are shaping the future of our children: For better or for worse?* New York: Haworth Press.
- Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Fauri, D.P., Wernet, S.P., & Netting, F.E. (Eds.)(2000). *Cases in macro social work practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Figueira-McDonough, J. (2007). *The welfare state and social work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gibbs, L.E. (2003). *Evidence-based practice for the helping professions*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Gibelman, M. (2003). *Navigating human service organizations: Essential information for thriving and surviving in agencies*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Gilbert, N., & Terrell, P. (2005). *Dimensions of social welfare policy* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gordon, L. (1994). *Pitied but not forgotten: Single mothers and the history of welfare*. New York: Free Press.
- Green, J.W. (1999). *Cultural awareness in the human services: A multi-ethnic approach* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hartung, J., & Henig, J. (1997). Housing vouchers and certificates as a vehicle for deconcentrating the poor. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32, 402-419.
- Hird, J.A., Reese, M., & Shilvock, M. (2004). *Controversies in American policy* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Jansson, B.S. (2009). *The reluctant welfare state: Engaging history to advance social work practice in contemporary society* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Jansson, B.S. (1999). *Becoming an effective policy advocate: From policy practice to social justice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Karger, H.J., Midgley, J., & Brown, C.B. (Eds.)(2003). *Controversial issues in social policy* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Karger, H.J., & Stoesz, D. (2006). *American social welfare policy: A pluralist approach* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Kirst-Ashman, K.K., & Vogel, V. (2003). *Introduction to social work and social welfare*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Lum, D. (2000). Culturally diverse social work practice [and] People of color. In Lum, D., *Social work practice and people of color: A process-stage approach* (4th ed.)(pp. 1-59). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Marx, J.D. (2004). *Social welfare: The American partnership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mather, J., Lager, P. B., & Harris, N. J. (2007). *Child welfare: Policies and best practices*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Mechanic, D. (1999). *Mental health and social policy: The emergence of managed care* (4th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Midgley, J., Tracey, M.B., & Livermore, M. (Eds.) (2000). *The handbook of social policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Hare, T. (2005). *Evidence-based practices for social workers: An interdisciplinary approach*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Phillips, N.K., & Straussner, S.L.A. (2002). *Urban social work: An introduction to policy and practice in the cities*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Piven, F.F., & Cloward, R. (1971). *Regulating the poor: The functions of public welfare*. New York: Random House.
- Poppo, P.R., & Leighninger, L. (2005). *Social work, social welfare, and American society*. Boston: Pearson.
- Quadagno, J. (1994). *The color of welfare: How racism undermined the war on poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rae, A., & Nocholas-Wolosuk, W. (2003). *Changing agency policy: An incremental approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rocha, C. J. (2007). *Essentials of social work policy practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rothman, J.C. (2005). *From the front lines: Student cases in social work ethics* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Skretny, J.D. (1996). *The ironies of affirmative action: Politics, culture, and justice in America*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Secombe, K. (1999). *So you think I drive a Cadillac? Welfare recipients' perspectives on the system and its reform*: Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wilson, W.J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Knopf.