

# Engaging Social Work Students in Research-based Field Education with Place-based Community Organisations

## Reflective Narrative

Teddy Nagaddya<sup>1</sup>, Brian Stout<sup>2</sup>

1 School of Social Sciences, Western Sydney University, Australia. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8812-139X>

2 School of Social Sciences, Western Sydney University, Australia. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5540-0915>

---

**Corresponding author: Teddy Nagaddya**

t.nagaddya@westernsydney.edu.au

---

## Abstract

Field education forms one of the fundamental pillars of social work training. The construction of this practicum around partnerships with place-based, not-for-profit organisations, though vitally important, remains challenging for contemporary social work. Historically, field education has been designed around students' observation of clinical practice and interaction with clients within a supervised and structured environment. While this model empowers students to meaningfully interact with the clients, a sole reliance on this approach limits their understanding of the multi-faceted nature of factors that shape clients' experiences of disadvantage. Pedagogical partnerships with community organisations and integrating research in field education practicum, will enable students to become critically aware of context-specific needs and socio-political structures within which social injustices occur. In this reflective article, framed within the lens of pedagogical partnerships, the authors maintain that place-based community partnerships, and work integrated learning within which students develop creative and innovative skills, is prioritised. Consequently, aspects of equity and social justice will be promoted. The authors reflect on the observations and lessons learned from engaging postgraduate social work students in a research-based (in form of an evaluation) field education practicum with a community organisation in Australia.

**Keywords:** *Field education; Social work; Research; Community partnerships*

## Background

The Australian social work curriculum is grounded in pedagogical practices that socialise students to their social work roles (Cleak & Zuchowski, 2020; Wayne et al., 2010). One such practice is field education – a distinctively social work form of instruction that integrates theory with practice (AASW, 2021). The process allows students to reflect and act upon the social world for purposes of transforming it – here referred to as praxis – a term coined by Paulo Freire (1970). But praxis in field education is achievable where those in humanising vocations such as social work, engage in dialogical encounters with ‘others’ – the marginalised, to critically draw relevant distinctions and contradictions between personal and social realities (Freire, 1970, p. 32).

Ife (2009) observed that meaningful dialogical encounters occur in settings that shape the everyday practices and behaviours of marginalised populations. For example, communities of migrants who share the complexities that come with geographical movement and cultural integration. It is within these contexts that field education which embraces dialogical encounters as an alternative to authority-based practice is constructed. Within this dynamic, social work interactions that seek to understand the service users’ relationship between human agency and social structures are established (Brisola et al., 2017).

In a community-based research field practicum, social work students engage in a relational process that enables them to learn how to investigate clients’ propositions of social interventions. Such environments play an important role in neutralising power relations and encouraging active participation of service users. Despite this understanding, the current model of field education sometimes pays sole attention to casework skills and student–field-supervisor relationships (Ketner et al., 2017; Vassos, 2019), rather than a broader field practice experience which demonstrates students’ contribution to improving communities. Roberson (2020) reminded us that, if field education is aimed at building competence for social work students, it should be framed in an environment that allows engagement with communities and experiential learning. And the way higher institutions of learning can achieve this is by embracing the notion of partnerships in pedagogy (Barrie & Pizzica, 2019).

The field education standards for social work students are set out by the accrediting board in Australia, the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) (AASW, 2021). The requirement for 1,000 hours of placement, split across two years and two agencies, provides the scope for the development of both community engagement and clinical skills (AASW, 2021). The most recent version of these standards does not make any direct reference to community development, group placements or carrying out research and evaluation for agencies. Such placements are clearly consistent with Australian Social Work Education Accreditation Standards (AASW, 2021), but they are not explicitly encouraged or promoted.

## Pedagogical Partnerships in Social Work Field Education

The role of field education in transforming social work curriculum through community partnerships is well-documented (Archer-Kuhn et al., 2021; Lewis et al., 2016; Wilson & Flanagan, 2021) but Australia has experienced a growing challenge of providing quality social work field education placements that contribute to building an effective human services workforce (Ayala et al., 2018; Cleak & Zuchowski, 2019; Egan et al., 2018; Liddell & Lass, 2019). Partly, this problem is attributed to neoliberal policies that underpin the operation and management processes of agencies. Morley and Dunstan (2013) asserted that, when market forces penetrate human service organisations, “field education programmes become constructed as expensive and resource intensive” (p. 144). When social work practices aimed at building an ethical, competent, responsive, and caring workforce are commodified, it detracts quality decision-making based on relational approach to working with clients and focuses on productivity measurement. This is not only a threat to social work identity but also to development of employability capacity within human services (McWilliam & Dawson, 2008). The whole situation necessitates careful identification of partners for field education.

For decades, partnerships have contributed to meeting the professional and accreditation requirements of social work practice (AASW 2021). In Australia and other developed economies, pedagogical partnerships have been used as a tool for teaching cultural competence and anti-oppressive practice (Bogo, 2010; Gollan & O’Leary, 2009; Robinson et al., 2016). In other instances, social work educators have designed courses that integrate aspects of service learning in the curriculum through the engagement with already established community partnerships (Gerstenblatt & Gilbert, 2014). All these approaches promote reciprocal relations, student learning and reflection but the courses designed tend to benefit students rather than community partners.

Partnerships in the current context of social work field education are important in providing a nexus between research and practice (Adams, 2019; Drolet, 2020; Preston et al., 2014). A national survey of Australian field education programs highlighted the need for increased research collaborations as part of field education (Zuchowski et al., 2019). This would cater for the learning needs of the diverse student cohorts and further enhance innovations in social work. The aim is to build a creative and innovative workforce that goes beyond the rhetoric of challenging systems of oppression to developing practical creative alternatives. Facilitating community development partnership placements for social work students is, therefore, not merely a pragmatic response to a growing student cohort. It is an engagement with how change can be achieved in society.

However, the integration of research through partnerships in social work field education, though desired, remains a challenge for tertiary institutions (Gavrilă-Ardeleana, 2016; Hewson et al., 2010; Teater, 2017). Universities are experiencing state and federal government budgetary cuts which undermines research funding within the field education space (Morley & Dunstan, 2013). Yet, research-based field education partly enhances graduates’ transformative skills that are vital for improved employability capacity and job/work readiness (Bennett, 2019; Nguyen & Hartz, 2020; Pool & Sewell, 2007).

Employability has many meanings (Li et al., 2020), but it can be usefully described as the capacity and capability of graduates to build transferable skills that will lead to sustainable employment in a world of work characterised with risk and uncertainty (Higgs et al., 2019). Employability is not only limited to transferable skills, but it also takes into consideration aspects of building social and human capital (Tentama & Anindita, 2020).

Employability has become a key curriculum component (Cheng et al., 2021; Small et al., 2022; Yorke, 2006) and a national agenda to meet political, social, and economic needs (Stanford, 2019). This positions field education as a vital tool in advancing the employability agenda (Neden et al., 2018) and reinforces the long-standing relationship between higher education and the national economy (Pegg et al., 2012). For universities, this is not business as usual as graduates' attainment of a testamur will no longer be the primary determinant of employability. Instead, skills that help students navigate a volatile environment of work will be most preferred. However, the question remains: what collaborative mechanisms are available to support the development of social work students' employability capacity and how will universities hold up to this challenge?

Barrie and Pizzica (2019) highlighted the importance of engaging with multiple and diverse stakeholders (industry, non-government organisations, private organisations) who have a good sense of the realities and complexities of communities. If social work field practice is shaped as a partnership pedagogy, then students can develop abilities that are not specifically within the curriculum – such as the use of communication technology, innovation, negotiation, and networking – but are vital for sustainable education.

### **Context of the Partnership Establishment**

The social work field education program was organised as a research-based evaluation practicum of the services provided by a place-based community organisation. The evaluation project was a partnership between a local place-based community organisation, Connecting Grassroots Communities (CGC), and a metropolitan university. Prior to the evaluation, the university had established a working relationship with CGC. This relationship was based on the university and CGC's shared values of community transformation and social change, reflected in each partner's vision and mission. Cook-Sather (2022) alluded to the fact that authentic pedagogical partnerships must be formed on grounds of common values.

Established in the early 1990s, CGC's main goal is to improve the livelihood of families in crisis within the Liverpool neighbourhood (Stout & Nagaddya, 2020). With over 22,000 clients, it provides 68 programs and services to disadvantaged families, particularly women and children within the areas of Moorebank, Heckenberg, Casula, and Cecil Hills. The services include TAFE education programs and childcare services amidst operating a social enterprise sector that employs women in a library café, cleaner greener box, and clothes box.

CGC's philosophy of community change is based on a place-based, philanthropic model (Fehler-Cabral et al., 2016). The concept of place-based philanthropy is rooted in the history of unfair development policies that led to high-level poverty neighbourhoods in some developed countries such as the US – many of which were inhabited by migrants and people of colour (Turner, 2017). This attracted the attention of civil rights groups and other community agencies who advocated for, and advanced aspects of, neighbourhood empowerment. It gave rise to the concept of community development – a framework within which community-based agencies sought for different forms of support from federal and state governments and philanthropists to improve the well-being of the marginalised (Theodos, 2021).

For decades, philanthropic organisations and individuals have established relationships with community-based organisation in an effort to pool resources for place-based initiatives that are designed to address persistent forms of socio-economic disadvantage (Carlton & Lyons, 2020; Giloth, 2019; Phillips & Scaife, 2017). This approach is premised on the understanding that working with organisations that have a long-term commitment to a place produces, not only relations of trust, but also context-specific data, and solutions associated with systems change. Similarly, the place-based philanthropy model assumes that, while places contribute to shaping aspects of inequalities, it is within this same environment that solutions can be devised (Mack et al., 2014). The aim here is to pursue community change through a bottom-up approach.

The Liverpool LGA in which CGC is located, is a home to a significant population of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers (Soldatic et al., 2020). This does not only imply a culturally diverse region but also potential community capacity against which partnerships can be built for purposes of social change. It is within this lens that CGC has committed its resources to serving the needs of this community.

While CGC's programs are tailored to contribute to addressing the diverse needs of this community, little has been documented in terms of the programs' efficacy and how they enhance agency. CGC is dependent on external funding, either from partners or from philanthropists, and the documentation of its impact on the community is vital to its ongoing relationship with funders. Although CGC has its origins and roots in the community, it must engage with the standards, objectives, and audit culture of both the corporate and the public sectors if it is to achieve continued funding. This was a basis for CGC's engagement in a partnership with the university to design a research-based evaluation field education project with social work students.

### **Description of participating postgraduate students**

Social work students who participated in this field education program were female international postgraduates – mostly from Asia and Africa, showing the gendered nature of social work and an increasing demand for social work professionals in Australia. The group showed interest in advancing this project that had been initiated by an earlier cohort of postgraduate social workers under the supervision of the same academic. Lee and Ross (2020) reminded us that this continuity approach to field education programs is important in leading to the development of educational alliances which enriches students' learning experiences.

In their collectiveness as international students was their diversity in terms of age, research skills and interest in the program – all of which shaped how the group bonded, and managed group tasks. Social work is a relational practice (Corradini et al., 2020), and therefore for students to work as a team was one way of building this very important skill. And for international students, field placement is not only about fulfilling a prerequisite for completion of a social work degree and demonstration of competence in the field (Vassos, 2019), but it is also an avenue to learn to work in a new cross-cultural context.

Beecher and others (2010) point out that some international students can struggle with a lack of agency-specific knowledge and skills. They experience differences in practices some of which are framed within a western-centric approach to social work practice. It is therefore, imperative for educators to be cognisant of the need not to frame observed differences in culture or experience as deficits but rather as valued strengths.

Many international students struggle with adapting to the local social work systems, which makes it imperative for them to have practical field experience (Zuchowski et al., 2014). During the project, it was established that some students lived in the neighbourhood where the evaluation study was conducted. It is home to a significant number of migrants from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Some students spoke of coming from the same country of origin as the participants they worked with. This did not only enhance students' sense of identity but also empathy, as they could relate to migrant participants' everyday struggles. However, this did not mean that students necessarily had similar forms of marginalisation, but rather the commonality was in the attributes of gender and migrant status within which social injustices were constructed. Maidment and Egan (2020) asserted that locating oneself as an oppressed individual in a cross-cultural environment helps in being sensitive to difference, having empathy and avoiding prejudicial practices – attributes relevant to anti-oppressive social work practice and interventions. Tracy (2010) described this as self-reflexivity that enables researchers or community workers to be aware of their biases, beliefs, privilege, and values that underpin their worldview.

### **How the field education program with the community organisation was structured**

Organising field education practicums is a systematic process that involves relationship building, articulation of agency goals and positioning social workers within the context of the agency. Broadly, the process involved:

#### **Planning and relationship building with CGC**

Prior to fieldwork, supervisors briefed students about CGC and the initial work that had been done by the earlier cohort of social work students. A visit to CGC was organised for students as a way of building a working relationship and reducing cultural distance (Rubin et al., 2012). The visit gave students an opportunity to understand CGC's community programs, vision, mission, and their commitment to social justice issues. During the visit a discussion about the goal of the partnership, and responsibilities and expectations, and timelines for the evaluation was advanced. Familiarising oneself with the agency values enhances commitment to emancipatory actions (Repesa et al., 2023).

The program was designed to be completed within four months of implementation – aligned with the university academic calendar. Students were involved in writing several drafts of the field education practicum proposal drawing on the input from the planning meeting with CGC. The final proposal was submitted to the University Research Ethics Committee for ethical approval.

### **Developing CGC's theory of change and data collection**

To complete the outcome evaluation, students needed to be conversant with CGC's theory of change. Similarly, to many community organisations, CGC did not have a documented and explicit theory of change. The students engaged in a process of creating the CGC program logic model against which the theory of change would emerge. A program logic model is a tool that shows the relationship between an organisation's activities and expected outcomes (Cooksy et al., 2001). Approaching the theory of change from the program logic model was part of building students and CGC's capacity in organisational management – a demonstrated mutual benefit in pedagogical partnerships (Gerstenblatt & Gilbert, 2014). This collaborative process of designing the program logic model highlighted the interconnectedness of CGC's program values, resources, activities, and the expected outcomes.

And from this process, the emerging theory of change showed that women's socio-economic empowerment within migrant and refugee neighbourhoods is central to keeping communities and families in crisis safe and healthy. With a clear theory of change, the interview guide was refined. Students conducted in-depth interviews with CGC facilitators about their activities and how these aligned with the organisation's theory of change. Program beneficiaries were interviewed on its efficacy. This process honed students' skills in developing interview tools and interviewing.

### **Fortnightly feedback sessions**

Throughout the evaluation design and implementation process, students had feedback sessions with their supervisors every fortnight, as required (AASW, 2021). Constructive feedback empowers students to become self-regulated learners (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). The feedback sessions were conducted in a dialogical format that created an environment of open communication and balanced power dynamics. Students' good performance against their workplan was acknowledged and areas of improvement such as quality of interviews was discussed. Beddoe (2020) maintains that supervisory relationships provide students an opportunity not only to gain confidence in their practice and reduce placement anxieties, but they also have a trickle-down effect on how students handle clients and construct their professional identities.

Supervisory relationships can become complex in situations involving international students who must navigate multiple identities in their field placements (Upshaw et al., 2020). Undeniably, field education programs are not independent of the socio-political context, so the diversification of the supervisory teams is necessary to create a contextually and culturally sensitive approach to supervision. The supervisory team was diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, and age.

During the supervisory sessions, students shared their field experiences in terms of challenges, successes, and group conflict. While this was a safe place for them to discuss any issues, it was also a space where their leadership and conflict resolution skills were developed. For instance, after the group had gone through processes of forming and norming (Tuckman, 1965), they agreed amongst themselves to have a team leader. The aim was to have that one person who would ably motivate, represent, and guide them throughout the project undertaking. Despite the team leader's commitment to team cohesion and the field project, conflict ensued in relation to how participant interviews were conducted. Pelled (1996) argued that, within a work group where there is diversity of members in terms of their demographic background, conflict is likely to occur in performing cognitive tasks. However, in such situations, supervisors should aim at giving students the autonomy to resolve conflict and make their own decisions. This is vitally important in developing personal and professional identities and group work skills. If students have an opportunity to make complex decisions while working with vulnerable populations, it gives them a good basis to choose future workplaces and engagements in advocacy and activism (Morley et al., 2020).

### **Lessons learned from the experiences of students doing research-based field placement.**

This section documents lessons learned throughout the process of engaging students in the research-based field placement, and the overall implications of pedagogical partnerships on community and higher institutions of learning.

### **Partnerships can be mechanisms for the university's localised social change initiatives**

It is widely considered that the location of a university contributes to the realisation of educational aspirations of members in that community (Barrie & Pizzica, 2019). Similarly important is building transformative pedagogical initiatives with communities. The social work field education program with CGC provided a basis for articulating context-specific problems or needs from an insider perspective that the university can draw on to engage students in social change endeavours. Watson et al. (2011) described this as the "engaged university" – a concept that highlights the university's social responsibility through community partnerships for common good. For instance, the university provided intellectual capital to support the development of theory of change and evaluation of CGC programs.

Dean and others (2021) maintained that universities need to be seen to be contributing to initiatives of social change in the communities where they are anchored. One way of achieving this is through community partnerships for transformative purposes (Yamamura & Koth, 2018). It is an opportunity for the university to demonstrate and live out its stated values of enabling communities to thrive. That said, the focus is not only about visibility, but also learning and growing with the local community for purposes of creating authentic change.

Reliance on the evaluation of the effectiveness of CGC services and activities in improving the socio-economic conditions of migrant families was conceptualised as an anchor collaborative (Porter et al., 2019).



This model of field education has the potential to contribute to community development. Universities can deploy their resources to work alongside community organisations on a shared vision of a new and better neighbourhood.

Through this partnership the university demonstrated a shift from solely focusing on students' learning outcomes and casework skills development, to engaging them in a research-based field placement program. These students will all have, or have had, the opportunity to develop more traditional clinical social work skills in their other field work placement. This contrasts the conventional way of conducting field education practicums, in that it promotes students' creativity and professional autonomy (Raineri & Sala, 2019).

### **Partnerships are an effective tool for identifying community needs and building student engagement**

With the universities' increasing emphasis on work-integrated learning and employability (Barrie & Pizzica, 2019), building sustainable community partnerships has become a pedagogical prerequisite for social work field educators (Price et al., 2013). This is not to ignore the current problem of finding quality social work placement opportunities (Egan et al., 2018), but rather to highlight the emerging direction of transformative field education.

Partnering with CGC proved to be a ray of hope for quality placements. The term quality is being used here to describe an environment of field education that allows students to develop a sense of autonomy, critical thinking and creativity, consequently accentuating commitment to addressing social problems. Quality placements will meet accreditation requirements, provide supportive learning environments for students, and meet the needs of the host organisation and the community. Students engaged in the process of developing CGC's program logic model and the theory of change, giving them an opportunity to hone their analytical, creative, and critical thinking skills (Alter & Egan, 1997). Students' potential to identifying patterns, alternative explanations to social problems, and thinking creatively on possible solutions is heightened. In the process, they are likely to identify the dominant discourses about marginalised communities, and rethink strategies to disrupt them.

Additionally, social work students' involvement with CGC's outcome evaluation project did not only create opportunities to do more but also led to prospects of sustainable engagement. The notion of doing more is about collectively continuing to address community needs that are identified through the evaluation process. Students identified resource mapping as an important next step (Stout & Nagaddya, 2020). This pedagogical approach invigorates the university–community partnerships for sustainable field education engagement. The outcome of this engagement with an insider creates opportunities to build long-term relationships for future advocacy work; “nuanced community understanding emerges from intimate familiarity” (Haanstad et al., 2020, p.4).

### **Partnerships enable social work students to acquire transferable abilities**

Community partnerships for field education both underscore the development of transferable skills (Barrie & Pizzica, 2019) and promote broader employability (Crisp et al., 2019; Pegg et al., 2012). Social work graduates and educators need to identify the qualities that differentiate them from other graduates in the labour market pool. From the process of proposal development to report writing, students were involved in activities that both tested their professional and ethical conduct and their personal behavioural practices. It was observed that throughout the research process they demonstrated: a high level of group pedagogical processes; adaptability through navigation of unfamiliar research communities; negotiating with CGC administrators on the evaluation schedule; and writing invitation emails to participants – important transferable abilities.

The field placement practicum involved a collaborative process of report writing. Students worked with the university academics and some CGC administrators in putting together a final evaluation report. Evaluation report writing is an area that is under-explored in the current model of field education for social workers (Collins et al., 2020). Yet, report writing for policy and social change is an important skill for social workers. Report writing enhances students' understanding of the social, political, economic, and cultural context that shape the realities of marginalised communities.

### **Partnerships for placements can provide a basis for co-curriculum transformation**

The CGC partnership process promoted the notion of learning by doing and acknowledging that learners are different. Social work field education experiences need to cater for different learning styles (Raschick et al., 1998). Field education should integrate aspects of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation, and active experiment. As supervisors, we observed at least some students engaging with each of these aspects at different stages of the evaluation project. For instance, the interview sessions were organised in such a way that one student observed and took notes (reflective observation) while the other interviewed the participant (active experiment). A quality placement gives students opportunities to learn in different ways at different times – both complementing learning approaches that they are comfortable with and stretching students to learn in new and different ways.

Students interacted with CGC administrators and community residents at different stages of the evaluation. This was an avenue to gain context-specific knowledge through interrogating the everyday lives and practices of migrant families. and collating information about the general local community. In addition, students learnt how theory-driven interventions are applied to marginalised groups under appropriate conditions. They made a connection between context, mechanism, and outcome.

This knowledge is important in informing and transforming of the social work curriculum. As maintained by Lewis et al. (2016), this process reduces the gap between what is learned in a classroom setting to what happens in the field. Understanding the local context is not only a vehicle for designing context-specific curricula but also producing context-based innovations and competent professionals who have an expertise of a specific place.

Van de Ven (2004) argued that competence is embedded in the specific contexts in which it was created. This distinctive competence plays a fundamental role in mitigating the tendency of homogenising marginalised communities, masking their realities, an area of politics leading to one-size-fits-all interventions.

## Conclusion

Providing a critical model of field education through place-based community partnerships is important – although it remains relatively marginal. With the current field education model that is predominantly focused on developing casework skills, structured supervisory practices, within the confines of agencies – there is a risk of universities producing social work graduates with limited community experience. Educators and curriculum developers who solely develop clinical skills may become disconnected from the ever-changing neighbourhoods in which social work practice occurs. Economic growth and community transformation bring risks as well as opportunities and can be supported by sensitive and appropriate social work interventions.

This is an incentive to structure field education around place-based community partnerships that empower students to explore the contexts in which social interventions are implemented. Students will then begin to ask the most important and critical questions associated with understanding neighbourhoods, their practices, and perceptions towards social interventions. Social work educators will contribute to advancing the notions of social work experiential learning, place-based science, enhanced anchor collaboration and build a pool of locally tailored social workers and solutions. Place-based partnerships that expand beyond ordinary community agencies have the potential of empowering local communities and reframing the position of universities in the communities where their campuses are located.

## References

- Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW). (2021). *Field education standards*. <https://www.aasw.asn.au/>
- Adams, D. R. (2019). Social work's role in collaborative community-academic partnerships: How our past informs our future. *Social Work, 64*(1), 19–28.
- Alter, C., & Egan, M. (1997). Logic modeling: A tool for teaching critical thinking in social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Education, 33*(1), 85–102.
- Archer-Kuhn, B., Samson, P., Damianakis, T., Barrett, B., Matin, S., & Ahern, C. (2021). Transformative learning in field education: Students bridging the theory/practice gap. *The British Journal of Social Work, 51*(7), 2419–2438.
- Ayala, J., Drolet, J., Fulton, A., Hewson, J., Letkemann, L., Baynton, M., Elliot, G., Judge-Stasiak, A., Blaug, C., Schweizer, E., Gérard Tétreault, A. (2018). Field education in crisis: Experiences of field education coordinators in Canada. *Social Work Education, 37*(3), 281–293.
- Barrie, S., & Pizzica, J. (2019). Reimagining university curriculum for a disrupted future of work: Partnership pedagogy. In *Education for employability* (Vol. 2; pp. 143–152). Brill.
- Beddoe, E. (2020). The supervisory relationship. In *Fieldwork in the human services* (pp. 41–54). Routledge.
- Beecher, B., Reeves, J., Eggertsen, L., & Furuto, S. (2010). International students' views about transferability in social work education and practice. *International Social Work, 53*(2), 203–216.
- Bennett, D. (2019). Graduate employability and higher education: Past, present and future. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education, 5*, 31–61.
- Bogo, M. (2010). *Achieving competence in social work through field education*: University of Toronto Press.

- Brisola, E. B. V., Cury, V. E., & Davidson, L. (2017). Building comprehensive narratives from dialogical encounters: A path in search of meanings. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas)*, 34(4), 467–475.
- Carlton, L., & Lyons, S. (2020). Community foundations at work: Mobilizing and connecting place-based philanthropy. In P. R. Elson, S. A. Lefèvre, & J.-M. Fontan (Eds.), *Philanthropic foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous perspectives and pathways to change*, 216–238.
- Cheng, M., Adekola, O., Albia, J., & Cai, S. (2021). Employability in higher education: A review of key stakeholders' perspectives. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 16(1). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/HEED-03-2021-0025/full/pdf?title=employability-in-higher-education-a-review-of-key-stakeholders-perspectives>
- Cleak, H., & Zuchowski, I. (2019). Empirical support and considerations for social work supervision of students in alternative placement models. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 47(1), 32–42.
- Cleak, H., & Zuchowski, I. (2020). Mapping social work field education in the 21st century: A national survey of the Australian context. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 50(2), 427–446.
- Collins, M. E., Dixon, Z., & Zimmerman, T. (2020). Building policy practice into foundation field placement: Experiences and outcomes. *Social Work Education*, 1–14.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2022). The necessary “anchoring innovation” of pedagogical partnership. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 6(2), 8–11.
- Cooksy, L. J., Gill, P., & Kelly, P. A. (2001). The program logic model as an integrative framework for a multimethod evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 24(2), 119–128.
- Corradini, F., Landi, C., & Limongelli, P. (2020). Becoming a relational social worker. Group learning in social work education: Considerations from unconventional practice placements. *Relational Social Work*, 4(1), 15–29.
- Connell, R., Fawcett, B., & Meagher, G. (2009). Neoliberalism, new public management and the human service professions: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Sociology*, 45(4), 331–338.
- Crisp, G., Higgs, J., & Letts, W. (2019). The employability agenda. In *Education for Employability* (Vol. 2; pp. 3–12). Brill.
- Dean, S. R., Lopez, S. T., & Taylor, H. (2021). Place-based community engagement in higher education: A strategy to transform universities and communities. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 58(1), 110–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2020.1723605>
- Drolet, J. (2020). A new partnership: Transforming the field education landscape—intersections of research and practice in Canadian social work field education. *Field Educator*, 10(1). <https://fielddeducator.simmons.edu/article/transforming-the-field-education-landscape/>
- Egan, R., Chee, P., Long, N., McLean, S., Parrish, J., & Spencer, A. (2018). Field education as a distinctive pedagogy for social work education. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education*, 20(1), 32–46.
- Ellis, G. (2020). Reflective learning and supervision. In *Fieldwork in the Human Services* (pp. 227–238): Routledge.
- Fagan, C., Cooper, A., Chatzifragkou, A., & Bennett, E. J. (2020). Principles in partnership: Embedding employability in curriculum design. *The Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*, 6(1). <https://www.journals.studentengagement.org.uk/index.php/studentchangeagents/article/view/1010>
- Fehler-Cabral, G., James, J., Preskill, H., & Long, M. (2016). The art and science of place-based philanthropy: Themes from a national convening. *The Foundation Review*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1300>
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed (MB Ramos, Trans.). *New York: Continuum*, 2007.
- Gavrila-Ardeleana, M. (2016). Increasing the employability of social workers through the research project. *European Proceeding of Social and Behavioural Sciences, EpSBS, Future Academy Volumul Aniversar Lumen*, 15, 363–370.
- Gerstenblatt, P., & Gilbert, D. J. (2014). Framing service learning in social work: An interdisciplinary elective course embedded within a university–community partnership. *Social Work Education*, 33(8), 1037–1053.
- Giloth, R. (2019). Philanthropy and economic development: New roles and strategies. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 33(3), 159–169.
- Gollan, S., & O'Leary, P. J. (2009). Teaching culturally competent social work practice through black and white pedagogical partnerships. *Social Work Education*, 28(7), 707–721.
- Haanstad, E., Robinson, G., & Webb, S. (2020). The crucial role of community liaisons in place-based experiential education organizations. *Collaborations: A Journal of Community-Based Research and Practice*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Hajdu, M., & Simoneau, C. (2020). Communicating science in a policy context to a broader audience. In *Science for policy handbook* (pp. 166–179). Elsevier.

- Hewson, J. A., Walsh, C. A., & Bradshaw, C. (2010). Enhancing social work research education through research field placements. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, 3(9), 7–16.
- Higgs, J., Letts, W., & Crisp, G. (2019). *Education for Employability (Vol. 2) : Learning for Future Possibilities*. Brill.
- Ife, J. (2009). *Human rights from below: Achieving rights through community development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ketner, M., Cooper-Bolinsky, D., & VanCleave, D. (2017). The meaning and value of supervision in social work field education. *Field Educator*, 7(2).
- Lee, A. S., & Ross, S. (2020). Five ways to get a grip on evaluating and improving educational continuity in health professions education programs. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 11(5). doi: [10.36834/cmej.69228](https://doi.org/10.36834/cmej.69228)
- Lewis, L. A., Kusmaul, N., Elze, D., & Butler, L. (2016). The role of field education in a university–community partnership aimed at curriculum transformation. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(2), 186–197.
- Li, K., Peng, M. Y.-P., Du, Z., Li, J., Yen, K.-T., & Yu, T. (2020). Do specific pedagogies and problem-based teaching improve student employability? A cross-sectional survey of college students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1099. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01099>
- Liddell, J. L., & Lass, K. (2019). Where's the community practice? Gaps in community practice education in a clinical-community social work program. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 39(1), 42–59.
- Mack, K., Preskill, H., Keddy, J., & Jhawahar, M.-M. K. (2014). Redefining expectations for place-based philanthropy. *The Foundation Review*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1224>
- Maidment, J., & Egan, R. (2020). *Practice skills in social work and welfare: More than just common sense*. Routledge.
- McWilliam, E., & Dawson, S. (2008). Teaching for creativity: Towards sustainable and replicable pedagogical practice. *Higher Education*, 56(6), 633–643.
- Morley, C., & Dunstan, J. (2013). Critical reflection: A response to neoliberal challenges to field education?. *Social Work Education*, 32(2), 141–156.
- Morley, C., Le, C., & Briskman, L. (2020). The role of critical social work education in improving ethical practice with refugees and asylum seekers. *Social Work Education*, 39(4), 403–416.
- Neden, J., Townsend, R., & Zuchowski, I. (2018). Towards sustainability in Australian social work field education. *Australian Social Work*, 71(3), 345–357.
- Nguyen, T., & Hartz, D. (2020). International students in Australia, employability and cultural competence. In *Cultural Competence and the Higher Education Sector* (pp. 331–348). Springer.
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218.
- Pegg, A., Waldock, J., Hendy-Isaac, S., & Lawton, R. (2012). Pedagogy for employability. In: Higher Education Academy.
- Pelled, L. H. (1996). Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. *Organization Science*, 7(6), 615–631.
- Phillips, S., & Scaife, W. A. (2017, November). *Has philanthropy found its place? Place-based philanthropy for community building in Australia and Canada* [Paper presentation]. ARNOVA 46th Annual Conference.
- Pool, L. D., & Sewell, P. (2007). The key to employability: Developing a practical model of graduate employability. *Education+ Training*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910710754435>
- Porter, J., Fisher-Bruns, D., & Ha Pham, B. (2019). *Anchor collaboratives: Building bridges with place-based partnerships and anchor institutions*. Community Engagement Administration. [https://epublications.marquette.edu/commengage\\_admin/3](https://epublications.marquette.edu/commengage_admin/3)
- Preston, S., George, P., & Silver, S. (2014). Field education in social work: The need for reimagining. *Critical Social Work*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.22329/csw.v15i1.5908>
- Price, S. K., Foreman Kready, S. B., Mogul, M., Cohen-Filipic, K., & Davey, T. L. (2013). Partnership process guidelines: Social work perspectives on creating and sustaining real-world university-community partnerships. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 6(1), 1–11.
- Raineri, M. L., & Sala, M. (2019). Unconventional Practice Placements. *An Italian Experience in Social Work Field Education*. 3 (2). <https://dx.doi.org/10.14605/RSW321901>
- Raschick, M., Maypole, D. E., & Day, P. A. (1998). Improving field education through Kolb learning theory. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 34(1), 31–42.

- Repesa, A., Rawlins, A., Ludwell, S. E., & Maslen, L. (2023). *A fresh approach to social work placements. Practice*, 35(1), 47–56.
- Roberson, C. J. (2020). Understanding simulation in social work education: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 56(3), 576–586.
- Robinson, M. A., Cross-Denny, B., Lee, K. K., Werkmeister Rozas, L. M., & Yamada, A.-M. (2016). Teaching note—Teaching intersectionality: Transforming cultural competence content in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(4), 509–517.
- Rubin, C. L., Martinez, L. S., Chu, J., Hacker, K., Brugge, D., Allukian, N., Rodday, A.M., Pirie, A., Leslie, L. K. (2012). Community-engaged pedagogy: A strengths-based approach to involving diverse stakeholders in research partnerships. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 6(4). doi: 10.1353/cpr.2012.0057
- Small, L., McPhail, R., & Shaw, A. (2022). Graduate employability: the higher education landscape in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(3), 919–933.
- Soldatic, K., Magee, L., James, P., Partoredjo, S., & Mann, J. (2020). Disability and migration in urban Australia: The case of Liverpool. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 456–473.
- Stanford, J. (2019). *The future of work for Australian graduates: The changing landscape of university*. The Australia Institute, Australia. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/2039026/the-future-of-work-for-australian-graduates/2791469/> CID: 20.500.12592/6n02n2.
- Stout, B., & Nagaddya, T. (2020). *Evaluation report: Liverpool Neighbourhood Connections Community Development Program*. <https://hdl.handle.net/1959.7/uws:59275><https://researchdirect.westernsydney.edu.au/islandora/object/uws:59275/>
- Teater, B. (2017). Social work research and its relevance to practice: “The gap between research and practice continues to be wide.” *Journal of Social Service Research*, 43(5), 547–565.
- Tentama, F., & Anindita, W. D. (2020). Employability scale: Construct validity and reliability. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(4), 3166–3170.
- Theodos, B. (2021). *Examining the assumptions behind place-based programs*. Urban Institute.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6). <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100>
- Turner, M. A. (2017). History of place-based interventions. US Partnership on Mobility from Poverty.
- Upshaw, N. C., Lewis Jr, D. E., & Nelson, A. L. (2020). Cultural humility in action: Reflective and process-oriented supervision with Black trainees. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000284>
- Van de Ven, A. H. (2004). The context-specific nature of competence and corporate development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21(1), 123–147.
- Vassos, S. (2019). Challenges facing social work field education: Commentary on “Factors that impact a social worker’s capacity to supervise a student” and “Placement educators’ experiences and perspectives of supervising international social work students in Australia”. *Australian Social Work*, 72(2), 245–247.
- Watson, D., Hollister, R., Stroud, S. E., & Babcock, E. (2011). *The engaged university: International perspectives on civic engagement*. Routledge.
- Wayne, J., Bogo, M., & Raskin, M. (2010). Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 46(3), 327–339.
- Wilson, E., & Flanagan, N. (2021). What tools facilitate learning on placement? Findings of a social work student-to-student research study. *Social Work Education*, 40(4), 535–551.
- Yamamura, E. K., & Koth, K. (2018). *Place-based community engagement in higher education: A strategy to transform universities and communities*. Stylus Publishing.
- Yorke, M. (2006). *Employability in higher education: What it is—what it is not* (Vol. 1): Higher Education Academy York.
- Zuchowski, I., Cleak, H., Nickson, A., & Spencer, A. (2019). A national survey of Australian social work field education programs: Innovation with limited capacity. *Australian Social Work*, 72(1), 75–90.
- Zuchowski, I., Hudson, C., Bartlett, B., & Diamandi, S. (2014). Social work field education in Australia: Sharing practice wisdom and reflection. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education*, 16(1), 67-80.